REPORT RESUMES

016 136 VT 004 317

OUNSELOR DEVELOPMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY, CONFERENCE
ECOMMENDATIONS FROM INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
OVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS IN THE PROFESSIONAL
EPARATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSELORS (WASHINGTON, D.C.,
UNE 2-3, 1965).
Y- MCGOWEN, JOHN F. AND OTHERS
ANPOWER ADMINISTRATION (DOL), WASHINGTON, D.C.
PUB DATE 65

DRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC-$12.88 320P.

ESCRIPTORS- CITY GOVERNMENT, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, STATE
OVERNMENT, *GOVERNMENT ROLE, *COLLEGE ROLE, COLLEGE
OOPERATION, *COUNSELORS, *CONFERENCES, COUNSELOR ROLE,
OUNSELING GOALS, COUNSELING SERVICES, COUNSELOR FUNCTIONS,
COUNSELOR TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS, SOCIAL
HANGE, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION,
UBPROFESSIONALS, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT,

THE CONFERENCE WAS ATTENDED BY APPROXIMATELY 110 TOP EVEL REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL OVERNMENT, UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, AND AGENCIES EMPLOYING OUNSELORS. FIVE CURRENT PROBLEM AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND OMMON CONCERN IN GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITY RELATIONS WERE TUDIED--(1) PROJECTING THE TOTAL QUANTITY OF COUNSELING ERSONNEL REQUIRED IN OUR SOCIETY, (2) DETERMINING ACCEPTABLE ND JUSTIFIABLE ROLES, FUNCTIONS, AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR OUNSELING PERSONNEL, (3) MEETING GOVERNMENT PROGRAM NEEDS HILE STILL PRESERVING NECESSARY AND REASONABLE PROFESSIONAL UTONOMY, (4) DEVELOPING NEEDED LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATION, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, AND COMPLEMENTARY UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION O IMPLEMENT INTEGRATED PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR COUNSELING ERSONNEL, AND (5) IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF COUNSELING ERVICES, AND FACILITATING THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF COMPETENT COUNSELING PERSONNEL THROUGH APPROPRIATE ODIFICATIONS OF EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS. NINE WORK-STUDY APERS INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT WERE PREPARED BY RECOGNIZED UTHORITIES TO PROVIDE THE CONFEREES WITH BASIC AND CURRENT ACKGROUND MATERIALS. ONE OF THE MANY RECOMMENDATIONS WAS HAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN A NATIONAL DVISORY COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING MANPOWER. (FS)

ED016136

Counselor Development in American Society

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS IN THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSELORS

VT004317

Washington, D. C. June 2-3, 1965

COUNSELOR DEVELOPMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS IN THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSELORS

A report to the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training (U.S. Department of Labor) and the Office of Education (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

Washington, D. C., June 2 and 3, 1965,

PREFACE

This report was prepared under contract with the Department of Labor, through the research program of the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (formerly called the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training) under Title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. Under its policy of making the findings of research contractors fully available to the research community as soon as possible, the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research reprinted this report in the form in which it was received from the contractor. The distribution of this report by the Department of Labor does not necessarily imply that the Department accepts the conclusions or recommendations of the contractor as stated in this report.

FOREWORD

The proposal for this Conference grew out of a concern of the Panel on Counseling and Selection of the National Manpower Advisory Committee. The Panel has become convinced that there are serious hazards involved in the demand for substantially larger numbers of counselors that is inherent in much recent Congressional legislation, some of which is school legislation, some manpower legislation. The legislation itself, and many of the agencies responsible for its execution, suffer from an inadequate understanding of the capacity of the University Graduate School to increase quickly its output of counselors (or similar professional and technical personnel) without danger of serious damage to the normal development of its existing programs of preparation. Universities responding to this demonstration of national need for professional personnel, or perhaps responding to the temptation of securing substantial subsidy, have become frustrated. As "crash" programs have increased some of the most significant institutions have begun to rebel. In part this is because the provision of Government and of Foundation subsidy in research over the past decade or so has made many universities sensitive to the subtle influence of available money upon the integrity of the University's normal programs of development.

Hence an Invitational Conference designed to bring top-level brains to bear upon the increasingly complex relation of Government and University. Using an analysis of the supply and demand for counselors and those in counselor-related vocations as a model, the Conference studied ways of bringing about a better understanding by Government agencies of University operations and a better understanding by the University of the reasons for legislation and the operation of Government agencies. Drafts of the nine work-study papers and the historical analysis by Darley were sent to all participants some weeks in advance of the Conference in order to insure some preparation for the intensive hours of the Conference.

The recommendations of the Conference provide the meat of this report, but there are some very substantial hors d'oeuvres in these study papers and in the three invited addresses by President Harrington, Professor Darley, and Senator Morse.

This Conference, I believe, provided an unprecedented consideration of counseling by non-counselors representing Government, education, and professional associations. This invited "invasion" of the counseling field by critical analysts from other areas of society resulted in some of the recommendations being closer to social reality than they would have been otherwise. Counselors and counselor educators need this type of interaction and it is a mark of the growing maturity of the field that they asked for it. Consideration of the relation of program needs to professional autonomy, of distinctions between professional and subprofessional levels of operation in counseling, of the job conditions which attract and hold counselors, of the relation of legislation to the professional preparation of counselors -- all of these received a hard hitting consideration that is reflected in the recommendations. In a broad social sense, counseling "came of age" in this Conference.

The Panel which secured the grant -- a joint grant, it is to be noted, from Labor and Education -- is deeply grateful to the Task Group which assumed responsibility for the Conference, its Executive Committee, and most of all to the Director of the Project, Dr. John McGowan. The hundreds of hours spent by the Director and the Executive Committee, the Department staff who collected the data essential for the demand and supply papers by Hitchcock and Stripling, the writers of the study papers and the addresses -- add up to an impressive contribution. It would be in poor taste in this connection to quote Churchill's memorable words to England in her hour of agony, but it is still true that "many" in the fields of social legislation, social action, and education owe a great deal to these "few."

This report lays the groundwork for an effective development of counseling in all of its ramifications. More importantly, it provides for ways of improving the relation of Congress and the Executive Branches of Government to the University in their joint concern for the critical vocational and educational adjustments that lie ahead for both youth and adults. For of these two points in the future we are assured -- there will be much pressure upon millions to make vocational and life adjustments, and there will be an increasing need for Government and University to understand each other. The report deals with the implications of these assurances.

C. Gilbert Wrenn
Chairman, Panel on Counseling and
Selection of the National Manpower
Advisory Committee

INTRODUCTION

The idea for an Invitational Conference on government-university relations in the area of counselor preparation and employment originated with the Panel on Counseling and Selection, C. Gilbert Wrenn, Chairman, a subcommittee of the National Manpower Advisory Committee. During the course of its regular meetings members of the Panel had expressed concern over the possibility of problems developing between government agencies who provide funds for the training and/or employment of counselors, and the universities who provide training. Their concern was based in large part upon evidence of the great demand for counselors and counseling personnel being created through current legislation. They felt this intense demand could create a situation in which government agencies were competing among themselves for the existing supply, without making any orderly plans to assist in the training of new counseling personnel. They also felt that in order to be prepared to train counselors, the universities needed accurate projections of demand so that they could develop the needed staff, curricula and facilities.

In December of 1964, the Panel submitted a proposal to the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare for funds to conduct such a Conference. The proposal was approved and Professor John F. McGowan was selected to serve as Project Director. The University of Missouri, where Professor McGowan is employed, agreed to administer the Conference under contract with the two government agencies involved.

A Task Group of twenty nationally known people representing both government agencies and universities was selected to plan the Conference. The names of these people were previously listed. The Task Group met in early February of 1965 to: (1) make initial plans for the Conference; (2) nominate people for attendance; (3) decide on topics for work-study papers; and (4) establish basic policy guidelines. These policy decisions were then implemented by an Executive

Committee of the Task Group consisting of the Project Director and five additional members. They were Drs. Willis E. Dugan, David V. Tiedeman, Frank L. Sievers, Mr. David H. Pritchard, and Dr. C. Gilbert Wrenn (ex-officio).

Nine work-study papers were prepared by recognized authorities for the purpose of providing the conferees with basic, current, background material. (Copies of these papers are included in this report.) The work-study papers were prepared during March and April, were reviewed by the Task Group at its second meeting in early May, and mailed to the conferees approximately three weeks before the Conference.

The Conference itself was held in Washington, D. C., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on June 2 and 3. The Conference was attended by approximately 110 top level representatives of the federal, state and local government, universities and colleges, and agencies employing counselors. The following specific groups were represented: (a) University officials including presidents, vice-presidents, deans, department heads, and selected counselor educators; (b) Government officials in charge of agencies who provide counseling service, and whose agencies often provide funds for the training of counselors; (c) Representatives from appropriate professional organizations; (d) Representatives from both public and private agencies who employ counselors; (e) Supervisors of counseling services; and, (f) Counselors.

A list of the participants is provided in Appendix A and a review of the names of the people who attended the Conference clearly reflects the professional status of the conferees.

The Conference opened with a general session and an invited paper prepared and delivered by Fred H. Harrington, President of the University of Wisconsin. The second general session consisted of a panel with representatives of four government agencies who employ a large number of counselors reacting to a paper prepared by Dr. John G. Darley, in which he reviewed the history of government-university relations in the area of counselor preparation at the University of Minnesota. Copies of both papers and the panelists' reactions are included in this report. The entire Conference was honored with a luncheon speech on the topic "How an Idea Becomes a Law" presented by The Honorable Wayne Morse, United States Senator from Oregon. The conferees then broke into small group sessions for the rest of the afternoon and most of the next morning. A final summary session was held immediately before the Conference closed at noon.

Since the Conference was scheduled for only a day and a half, the Task Group decided that it would be best to provide some structure for the conferees. The Task Group met for two days in early May, and, on the basis of their previous discussions followed by a two day study of the materials contained in the work-study papers, they identified _five current problem areas of significance and common concern in government-university relations_. They are:

I. How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to projecting the total quantity of counseling personnel required in our society based upon different kinds and levels of services in a multiplicity of settings?

II. How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to determining acceptable and justifiable roles, functions, and qualifications for counseling personnel: professional counselors, ancillary personnel, and technical or subprofessional personnel?

III. How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to meeting government program needs while still preserving necessary and reasonable professional autonomy in determining on-the-job counselor activities?

IV. How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to developing needed, general as well as categorically legislative authorization, financial support and complementary university organization to implement integrated programs of education for counseling personnel?

V. How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to improving the quality of counseling services, and facilitating the recruitment and retention of competent counseling personnel through appropriate modifications of employment conditions: supervision, case loads, facilities, opportunities for continuing education, access to supporting resources, position classifications, salary levels, etc.?

It was decided to present these five problem areas to the conferees for their study and recommendations.

In order to give them an opportunity to discuss the topics, the conferees were assigned into ten groups of approximately ten each. To facilitate the proceedings, chairmen and rapporteurs were appointed for each group. A rapporteur is defined by Webster as "an official charged with drawing up and presenting reports (guidelines of consensus) as from a parliamentary commission to the main body." Each group could discuss any of the problems that were of interest to them, but would be held responsible for the preparation of recommendations on the one major topic which was assigned to their group. The ten smaller groups were combined on the second morning into five larger groups to prepare joint recommendations. On the second morning the tentative recommendations prepared the previous afternoon and evening were discussed and tentative final recommendations on each of the five assigned topics were prepared and then read to the total group in a summary session. Each rapporteur was then given one week to prepare a final corrected copy of the recommendations. Copies of these recommendations were then sent to the Executive Committee for final editing. The Executive Committee met in July for two days and prepared the final report.

The final recommendations were edited and reorganized by the Executive Committee in order to improve continuity and make the recommendations easier to read and use. The recommendations are those prepared by the conferees and we did not intentionally make any significant additions or deletions in editing the material.

There is some obvious overlap or duplication in the final recommendations received from the five groups. Since the problem areas overlaped to a certain degree, and since each of the five groups prepared independent recommendations, some overlap was to be expected. The duplications were not deleted in editing since they appear to add emphasis to the need felt by two or more of the groups, acting independently, for action in a particular area of government-university relations. The final recommendations represent a consensus of opinion of influential and informed people representing both government and university, who feel that counseling services to people who look to counselors for help will be improved through the continued improvement of harmonious relationships between government and university.

A great many people gave much valuable time and invested a great deal of personal effort in making the Conference a success. Thanks are extended to the members of the Panel on Counseling and Selection, to the members of the Task Group, the authors of the work-study papers, the speakers, the chairmen and rapporteurs, and the conferees themselves. Special recognition is due to the members of the Executive Committee, Drs. C. Gilbert Wrenn, Willis E. Dugan, David V. Tiedeman, Frank L. Sievers, and Mr. David H. Pritchard, who put a great deal of time and effort into the Conference. A final word of appreciation is due to Mrs. Delores Crockett who supervised the preparation of the manuscript for the work-study papers and this final report, who handled all correspondence and financial records, as well as the many details that were involved in arranging for the Conference.

John F. McGowan
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS 1

INVITED PAPERS 20

"The Universities and the Federal Government" 21

Fred Harvey Harrington, President
University of Wisconsin

"Some Aspects of History" 28

John G. Darley, Professor
University of Minnesota

REACTIONS TO DR. DARLEY'S PAPER 47

James F. Garrett, Assistant Commissioner 48
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Arthur L. Harris, Associate Commissioner of Education 53
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Louis Levine, Director 59
United States Employment Service

Cecil P. Peck, Chief 65
Psychology Division
Veterans Administration Central Office

LUNCHEON ADDRESS 71

"How an Idea Becomes a Law" 72

The Honorable Wayne Morse
United States Senator, Oregon

WORK-STUDY PAPERS 82

"Counselors: Supply, Demand, Need" 83

Arthur A. Hitchcock, Executive Director
American Personnel and Guidance Association

"Training Institutions: Standards and Resources" 112

Robert O. Stripling, Professor
University of Florida

PAGE

"Issues Related to a Study of the Influence of Salary, Methods of Selection, Working Conditions, Supervision, and Mobility Upon Selection, Training, and Retention of Counseling Personnel"....... 132

S. Norman Feingold, National Director
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service

"Roles and Functions of Professionally Trained Counselors"........ 193

Edward C. Roeber, Professor
University of Michigan

"Functions and Effects of 'Subprofessional' Personnel in Counseling".. 211

D. A. Hansen, Assistant Professor
University of California, Santa Barbara

"Crisis in Counseling: A Commentary and (Possibly) a Contribution".. 234

C. Gilbert Wrenn, Professor
Arizona State University

"From a Technology of Guidance in Schools to the Profession of Guidance-in-Society: A Challenge to Democratic Government"....... 249

David V. Tiedeman, Professor
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

and

Frank L. Field, Professor
University of California, Santa Barbara

"Social Change and Curriculum Development"....................... 276

Bob G. Woods, Professor
University of Missouri

APPENDIX A. Participants.. 292

APPENDIX B. Conference Schedule................................. 304

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROBLEM AREA I:

> How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to projecting the total quantity of counseling personnel required in our society based upon different kinds and levels of services in a multiplicity of settings?

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is important that the problem of meeting immediate pressing needs for additional counseling personnel does not conflict with the preparation of an adequate supply of fully qualified counselors. Therefore data on the total quantity of counseling personnel required in our society for different kinds and levels of services in a multiplicity of settings must be obtained on a systematic and regular basis. The present report documents the need for a greatly expanded quantity of professional counselors and related subprofessional and technical personnel. The systematic projection of the need for counseling personnel requires periodic collections, analyses, and syntheses of relevant data. Subsumed in such a service will be responsibility for:

(1) Establishment of definitions of different kinds and levels of counselor functions; and

(2) Periodic assembly of data relevant to the supply and demand of counseling personnel, classified according to kind and level of such personnel.

Projection of supply and demand requires analysis of data under the guidance of certain assumptions. On the other hand, the administration of the ongoing process of supplying demand requires continuous decision under guidance of current information on functions, needs, and capabilities.

This section presents Conference recommendations on the problem of projection. Subsequent sections will present Conference recommendations on how to provide for an increased supply of counseling personnel.

THE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDS:

1. That the Federal government establish and maintain a National Advisory

Committee on Counseling Manpower. That the Committee meet for the periodic development and refinement of such criteria as are required for accurately projecting the demand and supply of counseling services. The membership of this Committee should include representatives of agencies that now employ or that will employ counselors, of universities engaged in or planning for counselor preparation, and of interested relevant professional associations. (The establishment of similar committees at the State level should also be considered.)

The National and State committees are to establish criteria for the determination of:

a. Expectations for counseling services created by societal needs and demands.
b. The subsequent organization of counseling services implied by societal needs. (In considering the needs of specific programs, the committees should be concerned with counseling services in their entirety. This obligation requires stipulation of job duties and functions at all levels. Included should be specification of duties and functions which would be provided by various levels and kinds of professional, and subprofessional or technical personnel. The ratio of the professional to the technical or subprofessional staff, as well as the role of supervisory professional personnel, needs to be specified. Standardization of nomenclature of job titles will be necessary in order to discharge this obligation.)
c. The reservoir of existing counseling personnel.
d. The identification of potential recruits who can be fully trained within a specified period.
e. The organization of societal institutions, government and/or academic, for the provision through experience, training, and education of the required capability in counseling. This should include consideration of the relationship between didactic study and supervised practice in both initial preparation and upgrading.

f. The expectations for the levels and priorities of support in education and service required to achieve the desired goals.

2. That the Federal government authorize an agency to provide the necessary intergovernmental cooperation and to conduct the periodic supply and demand studies.

3. That government and universities provide for research to develop projections for counselor personnel at the various defined levels at the outset of all programs (particularly governmental programs) which support counselor preparation.

PROBLEM AREA II:

How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to determining acceptable and justifiable roles, functions, and qualifications for counseling personnel: professional counselors, ancillary personnel, and technical or subprofessional personnel?

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Now and in the foreseeable future, a vastly increased number of counseling personnel will be required in established social institutions and for work at new levels and settings within American society. The evident concern of our nation, through social and legislative actions supporting the concept of full development of human resources, requires this enlargement of counseling services. The role and function of needed counseling personnel will vary in terms of the needs of individuals being served, the expectations of the role within the job setting, and the level of counselor qualifications which range from fully professional to technical and/or subprofessional levels.

The expansion of counseling services in our changing society demands attention to such problems as the available supply, types of specialized preparation, levels and roles of counselors, as well as the effective utilization of the counselor in his employment setting.

THE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDS:

1. That the Federal government establish and maintain a National Advisory Committee on Counseling Manpower in order to provide for government and Universities a basis for coordination on matters pertaining to counselor recruitment and selection, preparation, job roles and utilization, and in the evaluation of counseling effectiveness.
2. That the government support establishment of a national roster of practicing counseling personnel at various levels of professional preparation and in different job settings.

3. That government periodically inform universities and their administrative officers of the urgent issues of counselor supply and demand and that they be informed about subsidies which are available to establish new or to expand existing programs of preparation of counseling personnel. (Professional policy statements such as those published by the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the American Psychological Association and the National Rehabilitation Association, and guidelines relating to institutional standards which qualify a university to conduct counselor preparation at graduate levels will be particularily significant.)

4. That professional associations representing counseling and related helping services be encouraged to define more clearly and uniformly the roles, functions, and recommended preparation of the several types of counseling personnel which they represent.

5. That government and universities recognize that different types of counseling personnel possessing different levels of training are needed to meet identifiable counseling needs of clientele in areas of educational, vocational and personal adjustment.

6. That the government and universities confer periodically through advisory committees in order to stipulate the common elements of counselor functions (professional, technical and subprofessional) as guidelines for training and expectations concerning levels of professional performance.

7. That government, universities and professional associations recognize the significance of inter-disciplinary studies in counselor preparation, and the relationship of multiple disciplines to the counselor's role and function.

8. That government and universities give renewed emphasis to research which will determine effective sequences of formal training and experience, and ratios of didactic content to practicum activity with respect to the generalized core and the specialized training of counselors.

9. That universities periodically examine their programs of training to deter-

mine their relevance, and to identify directions of change that may be necessary to provide the preparation needed for counseling personnel working at different levels and in different settings.

PROBLEM AREA III:

How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to meeting government program needs while still preserving necessary and reasonable professional autonomy in determining on-the-job counselor activities?

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The rapid expansion of counseling services can create problems related to the professional functioning of counselors. Serious problems often arise during the expansion of services with respect to the need for the counselor, as a professional worker, to maintain necessary and reasonable functional autonomy in the discharge of his counseling responsibilities. These problems relate to such matters as reasonable self-definition of work activities and methods, the expectations and requirements of administrative personnel, and the provision of professional supervision and its relation to administrative supervision. The distinctions and relations between professional counseling and technical subprofessional services, and the provision of satisfactory working conditions and professional incentives are also involved.

THE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDS:

1. That government and universities consider themselves obligated to insure that pressing need for additional subprofessional personnel should not receive priority over the preparation of fully qualified personnel. Every effort should be made to insure that the range of helping functions needed is provided by appropriately trained personnel employed in suitable positions. There should be no compromise in the quality of helping relationship functions in the face of pressing need for such services.
2. That government agencies, in collaboration with the profession, and with the appropriate government units concerned with fiscal and merit system controls carry responsibility for identifying and describing, on a periodic basis, the specific levels and types of functions appropriate to the individual

agency or governmental organization. Operational definitions of the counseling functions should be formulated for respective institutional settings, and job expectations should be communicated to all concerned in order to give the highest probability of understanding among administrators, counselor educators, counselors, clients, and the general public.

3. That government agencies, in collaboration with universities and professional organizations, should agree upon appropriate conditions for the provision of high quality services. These might include such elements as salaries attractive to people of professional potential, physical facilities, case loads, supervisory ratios, in-service education and other similar working conditions (for specifics, see Problem Area V).
4. That the government act on the premise that supervision and consultation by professionally qualified counselors is a prime requirement particularly applicable to beginning and subordinate personnel in counseling and counseling-related functions.
5. That government and universities cooperate to organize programs which provide continued study to the point of complete professional preparation for those who are initially employed with minimal training. Continuing education and training programs must also be developed to keep counselors and counselor educators abreast of new knowledge. Cooperation between employing agencies and training institutions is essential throughout, but particularly in the case of short-term training. Short-term programs of training should be limited to the preparation of technical personnel for specific functions, and for the continuing education of counselors.
6. That government and universities engage in research studies and demonstration projects which examine the possibility of greater diversity in providing helping relationship functions in government agencies, and methods of preparing persons to fulfill more diverse functions. Care should be taken that research or pilot development projects are clearly delineated from operational programs.

7. **That government and universities organize to achieve increased communication on research and demonstration findings relating to successful practices for social action. A clearing house of effective methods, with provision for feedback to government agencies, universities, and other institutions with relevant concerns should be established, maintained, and used.**

PROBLEM AREA IV:

How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to developing needed, general as well as categorically legislative authorization, financial support and complementary university organization to implement integrated programs of education for counseling personnel?

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Active and informed government-university cooperation is essential in order to insure the passage of sound legislation related to the provision of counseling services. Legislation which increases the demand for counseling personnel must, at the same time, provide support for the expansion and improvement of counselor training programs. Knowledge of client needs, training methods, and counselor competencies, acquired during the operation of training programs and ongoing programs offering counseling services should be reflected in proposed legislation.

Programs of counselor training in institutions of higher education must be planned in cooperation with representatives of appropriate professional associations, representatives of government agencies, and representatives of recognized university training programs in order to insure integrated programs of counselor education that make full use of university resources.

THE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDS:

I. Support

1. That the government provide broad, flexible, long-term teaching grants to educational institutions which would allow them to expand, strengthen, and improve counselor education programs. The support should encompass authority to assist institutions in all necessary parts of their counselor education programs, including curriculum, faculty and staff, expanded and improved facilities, as well as financial support to encourage and enable qualified students to enroll on a full-time basis in counselor training programs at institutions of higher education.

2. That grants be allotted only to institutional programs that can confidently be expected to increase the output of professionally prepared counselors. Criteria for the use of funds within each program, as they relate to salaries, facilities, equipment, etc., should be flexible in order to meet the specific needs of each institution. Grants should be authorized for the initiation of programs in selected institutions.
3. That the Federal government provide support for counselor preparation on a continuous basis. Such support should be of a generalized nature, with the statutory authority stipulating a minimum of restrictions, and should provide for funding training programs for subprofessional personnel as well as training programs for professional personnel. (Continuity of government support for training programs is essential in order to build and maintain good facilities and to develop and hold qualified staff.)
4. That the government provide support for basic and applied research, the findings from which may contribute to more effective education and supervision of counselors and to the improvement of counseling practice.
5. That specialized support should be continued and expanded as necessary for training programs designed to meet identified urgent needs for counseling personnel. Such training programs may be either pre-service or in-service, but in either case should include or be preceded by basic core courses in counselor preparation offered by qualified institutions of higher education. The programs can be designed for the purpose of meeting specific agency needs, however, such pre-service, in-service or short-term preparation is for special emergency needs only and not for purposes of basic counselor preparation which should be on a full-term basis.

II. Legislation and Consultation

1. That both government and universities take steps to insure that future legislation calling for the expansion of counseling services provide funds and authorization for:

a. The hiring of an adequate, professional counseling staff in the government agency responsible for administering the program;
b. Adequate institutional grant support (as outlined above);
c. Adequate support to provide for the supervision of practicum and internship training, both on campus and in agency settings; and
d. Adequate professional on-the-job supervision.

2. That arrangements be made to insure the participation of universities early in the process of preparing regulations to implement legislation requiring counseling personnel, and that the responsible government agency confer with appropriate professional representatives both within and outside the government before developing regulations to implement legislation.
3. That the government establish qualified advisory committees to serve on a continuing basis.
4. That it is the responsibility of the government agency involved to have personnel with adequate qualifications in the area of counseling available in order to make optimum use of consultation with professional personnel in institutions of higher education regarding the development of programs for the preparation and supervision of counselors.

III. University Responsibility

1. That universities recognize their responsibility for establishing and maintaining counselor education programs of high quality and for consulting with professional personnel in government agencies who are knowledgeable about counselor education, counseling practices, and counseling manpower needs. Such consultation must involve government administrators who are responsible for programs related to counselor preparation and supervision and for programs providing counseling services. However, while providing counselor training under government support, institutions of higher education must maintain their integrity and academic freedom

with regard to selection of students, curriculum, standards of instruction, and academic credit.

2. That universities have the responsibility to define and coordinate programs of counselor education.
3. That universities establish effective liaison with agencies concerned with counselor preparation and who are in a position to offer field supervision.
4. That training to prepare individuals for work in particular settings or with special client populations should be included in the university curriculum. While this may consist in part of special didactic courses, the major contribution to this end would be made in the practicum and internship phases of preparation. Such programs should utilize appropriate agencies.
5. That there should be recognition of a basic common core of counselor preparation, so that existing curricula may be used to the fullest extent and so that the proliferation of numerous specialized programs may be avoided.
6. That in order to promote effective yet flexible counselor education within an institution, each university having a counselor training program should establish a committee to coordinate instruction within the university among the disciplines involved.
7. That counselor educators should allocate their sabbatical leave, from time to time, to work in government agencies that employ counseling personnel.
8. That universities and government provide increased opportunity for in-service and out-service courses and programs of education.
9. That the government provide financial assistance, through universities, to selected qualified persons in order to allow them to further their education. The assistance should include funds for subsistence, tuition, transportation, and other educational costs.

10. That the counselor be supervised by a professionally trained person whose training is at least equivalent to that of the individual he supervises. It is also important that the recruitment and selection of individuals to enroll in university programs of counselor education and the instructional programs themselves (except for necessary cross-cultural or cross-disciplinary training) be carried out by persons who are, themselves, professional counselors.
11. That support be given to the preparation of an adequate number of doctoral-level personnel to meet the needs of teaching, research, and supervision, as well as to provide an adequate number of practioners at this level.
12. That universities limit short-term programs of training to the preparation of technical personnel for specific functions and to the continuing education of counseling personnel who have already completed a substantial amount of formal counselor training. Such short-term programs might include extension and off-campus continuing education for employees in operating agencies.
13. That universities emphasize quality in their programs of preparation and that the programs should meet standards endorsed by professional associations.
14. That universities make greater use of qualified agency personnel as consultants and as supplementary staff, in developing their counselor education programs. Agencies at both the local and national level should arrange leaves of absence, release time, etc., as appropriate. It is likewise the responsibility of institutions of higher education to make professional staff available to consult with and to work for short periods of time in government agencies responsible for providing counseling services.

IV. Practicum Training

1. That both government agencies and universities have a joint responsibility

for the supervision of persons who are in training status, with the agency's responsibility for supervision increasing as a person moves toward completion of the training program and readiness for employment.

2. That the universities include, where appropriate, practicum experience for their students in relevant government agencies.
3. That agencies and universities both recognize that the practicum phase of counselor education is a means of quality control at all levels of preparation.
4. That training institutions or the practicum agency must be willing to terminate trainees whose performance in practicum is unsatisfactory.
5. That government and universities recognize that preparation at the practicum and internship levels requires a high ratio of faculty to students and of agency supervisors to trainees.
6. That government agencies recognize their obligation to contribute to the preparation of counseling personnel by providing field training and/or internships, including professional supervision. The university must also recognize its obligation to participate in such supervision and to integrate the didactic and practicum aspects of the training.

PROBLEM AREA V:

> **How can government and universities cooperate currently and continuously with reference to improving the quality of counseling services, and facilitating the recruitment and retention of competent counseling personnel through appropriate modifications of employment conditions: supervision, case loads, facilities, opportunities for continuing education, access to supporting resources, position classifications, salary levels, etc.?**

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Counseling services will be strengthened by public acceptance of counseling as a professional career; a social role which has the capacity to attract, develop and maintain top quality personnel. The provision of counseling services in various settings ranging from elementary school to university, from industry to specialized settings, as well as a variety of government and related private agencies presents many models of counselor role and level. These models of counseling service must become more clearly distinguished while the common and specialized elements of their functions must also be made known to prospective trainees, counselor educators and employing agencies.

Some of the crucial issues which require immediate attention by government agencies and universities include: inequitable salary schedules, lack of opportunity for advancement within the profession of counseling, undue restrictions in mobility from setting to setting and from level to level, inadequate job descriptions which do not clearly delineate responsibilities assigned to counselor personnel, and diversity in the extent of the recognition of counseling as a profession.

To attract and to hold persons in the counseling profession, the conditions of work must be improved in a number of settings and the rewards for performance must be commensurate with the importance and responsibility of the work. Financial rewards must be competitive with the rewards available in related professions that require a similar amount of training.

THE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDS:

1. That government agencies take steps to establish comparable qualification and classification standards among employing agencies.
2. That government agencies strive to make their professional positions in counseling attractive on a career basis. Development of counseling as a career will require attention to salary, arrangements for participation in non-job activities of a professional nature, and delineation of professional job duties.
    a. A position classification system is needed which will recognize the abilities and competencies of the individual and provide promotional incentive within the occupation in the employing agency. A job level structure based upon job evaluation over a period of years would provide a basis for such a system.
    b. Counseling, supervision, and administration each require special competencies; and competency in one area does not necessarily qualify a person for another. This fact should be taken into account in establishing a classification system.
    c. Non-counseling duties should be kept to a minimum or eliminated, and consideration should be given to using data processing procedures to handle routine mechanical matters encountered in the organization and performance of counseling services. The use of subprofessionals for certain tasks should be studied.
3. That the government explore the part-time use in their programs of professional counselors who are regularly employed elsewhere as a temporary expedient to provide urgently needed service and to demonstrate the value of an advanced level of training. As a result less well-prepared employees may be stimulated to take further training and a greater number of fully qualified individuals may be attracted to government employment.
4. That government agencies provide opportunities for counselor personnel in

government and community agencies to have planned orientation experiences in other settings.

5. That government and universities take drastic steps to provide counselors with offices that meet suggested professional standards.
6. That government agencies evaluate and finance counseling programs on the basis of the quality of the services provided as well as the number served.
7. That government agencies clearly identify job functions technical personnel can perform upon their employment. Competent supervision of technical personnel by professional personnel should be mandatory and available.

INVITED PAPERS

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

by

Fred Harvey Harrington, President
University of Wisconsin

Let me begin by asking two questions:

1. Why would I be willing to speak to a group which is considering a subject about which I know next to nothing? and,

2. Why should you be willing to listen to me?

The answer to the first question is fairly simple. It is the occupational habit of university presidents to give speeches on all subjects. Since human limitations make it impossible for them to be expert in every field, they are generally holding forth on topics about which they are at best ill-informed. (Granted, it would be better if they could listen rather than talk; but to introduce this approach would be to change the whole character of the presidency--which would not do at all.)

To look on the bright side: participating in this meeting has caused me to read your conference proposal and your working papers. This has been good for me, and the experience would be good for other university officials. For counseling, guidance, and counselor education is one of the fields least understood by administrators and faculty members in higher education. Reading the material prepared for this Conference has helped me identify some of your problems and disagreements. This was very educational for me and it would probably be a good thing for other university presidents, because certainly we must say that in the area of counseling, guidance, and counseling education we are dealing with an area about which many university administrators know very little. In many ways it is one of the areas which is least well understood on our campuses. Even in areas quite close to counseling there is much misunderstanding about it. In the student personnel field, which is quite closely connected with counseling, there is a great deal of misunderstanding. Possibly this is due to established rivalries which we find in many closely related fields; and counseling has been so successful lately, so able to attract federal money, so able to develop academic programs of research and teaching, that other fields close to counseling such as student personnel services are understandably a little jealous. Counseling has held a higher prestige or status position on campuses than do many of the other student personnel areas. On the other hand, while counseling has a position in the pecking order rather better than many of the student personnel activities, it does not occupy a top position with reference to top administration. A great many people in top administration at universities have rarely heard of counseling, and have rarely paid any attention to it. Many college administrators know little about it and consequently think it is not very important. In consequence, to make the answer to my first question ended--it's time to end it--I should say that getting into these questions has been good for me.

Question two is harder for me to handle: Why are you willing to listen to me? Perhaps you do not really want to listen to a university administrator; but certainly you are by now resigned to it. And there may be some point in hearing broad generalizations by an individual outside of your speciality--particularly at a time when there are sharp divisions in your field.

Surely there can be no doubt about the sharp divisions. I find more contrasts in viewpoint among counselors and counselor educators than among the specialists in high-energy physics, international relations, educational television, comparative literature, the health sciences, or the performing arts (and these people are at each other's throats all the time).

To an outsider, the counseling profession--if it is a profession--seems to be in total disagreement on training theory: Should preparation be extended, or can it be very brief? Should requirements for counselors be defined very closely and exactly or very generally and flexibly? There are strong, even bitter differences as to what is the proper role of the federal government in all of this (e.g., should the United States Employment Service do any counseling at all)? There seems to be no real consensus even among the trainers of counselors as to what counseling really is. Is it a real profession like medicine or journalism? Or, is it a tool, a method, an approach? I find major differences of opinion as to what counseling is supposed to accomplish, or is capable of accomplishing. Should it aim at suitable employment, or try to change the whole of people's lives? Yes, I find contrasts. I find counseling being treated as relatively unimportant, and I find it being shamefully oversold.

Perhaps I have not defined these divisions very well. No matter. However defined, the divisions do exist; and they lead me to make two broad observations:

First: Your troubles, your divisions and differences come mainly from the fact that your field is new. You have a lot of settling down to do; and you will do it.

Second: Because of the time of the coming-of-age of your specialty (right now), your fate and future depend largely on the development of an effective relationship between our educational system and the federal government. Especially important is an effective relationship between our universities and the federal government--and this relationship is not now nearly effective enough.

Now, to discuss these two points in detail:

First: You are young. The field of counseling and counseling education is new. I know that there has been counseling of sorts through the ages (everything can be traced back to the Greeks and ancient Chinese, if not to the cave man). But counseling and counseling education in the modern sense is just arriving. Vocational counseling as a specialty goes back a few decades, but many other branches of the business are very recent. It is only in the period since World War II that we have had this great upsurge of interest, this fantastic demand for counselors in elementary and secondary schools, in colleges, businesses, and government.

What does this mean? It means that counseling and counseling education are so new that they are still in the dizzy period--the stage of ferment and perplexity, frustration, confusion and uncertainty. And, I may add, unlimited opportunity.

Compare the field with an established discipline like my own, history (an established and rather stuffy specialty). One is reminded of the English literary critic who wrote about the great contemporary American novelist Thomas Wolfe. She found his work powerful and stimulating; but clumsy, too, and much disorganized. Well, said this British critic, what would you expect of an American writer? American literature is just emerging, and twentieth century writing in America is to be compared with English literature in the time of Chaucer. So with you. You are just beginning, though you have already shown strength as well as weakness. And the great days are ahead.

To be sure, counseling and counseling education has already spawned a vast and bewildering literature, some of it quite impressive, much of it rather bad. It is already too large for a single individual to read, or even list in a single bibliography. But despite the many words that have been spilled, it would be incorrect to say that your field has found definition, or has any very large body of clear and accepted fundamental theory.

This is a handicap; but it need not cause distress. You have the opportunity to create this basic framework in the next generation. You need not rely on the stale work of others; you can build your own edifice. What could be more inviting than that? Still, it has its problem areas. Your field is so new that many of those who now serve as counselors often have had relatively little formal academic training. Many have transferred from related specialties, often with little formal preparation and no particular qualifications--except that they "like people."

This has its good side if it leads to experimentation and opens new windows to the future. But it poses problems of quality which affect the reputation of your field. Seeing some inferior performances, academic or government colleagues and administrators may downgrade the whole counseling business. Then, too, even the brighter people in a new field may not have the time or the imagination to experiment. I note a few signs that suggest that rigidities are already creeping in; that some of you may want to pass up the opportunity to think broadly and boldly. I do implore you not to freeze your thinking, not to establish too many formulas just yet, not to insist on uniformity before you have tried a variety of approaches.

I must turn to my Second point. You are not here to discuss the age of your specialty. You are here to talk about university-government relations.

Actually, however, it is the same problem. This area also is new, and has the difficulties and the advantages of youth. In one generation we have had a triple revolution in university-federal government relations--a research revolution, a training or teaching revolution, an extension or social action revolution.

Each of these revolutions has had an important influence on higher education. Together they have had a greater impact on our major institutions than any other development of recent years, even the tidal wave of students. At the same time these revolutions have transformed the educational side of the government in Washington, and have altogether altered federal government relations with our campuses.

Counseling has been involved in each of these three revolutions:

The research revolution: Counseling has not picked up federal research support comparable to that available in the natural sciences; but it has access to more research money than counselors and counseling educators ever dreamed would be available.

The teaching revolution has been even more important in the counseling field. Funds to mount training programs and grants to trainees have enabled the profession to attract greater numbers, including some superior persons.

The social action revolution: Besides being centers for teaching and research, universities do many public service jobs, participate in problem-solving and the like. (Agricultural extension is the best historical example.) Somewhat neglected lately, this university role has been revived now that the United States government is moving towards solutions of urban, community, and overseas problems, and is fighting wars against poverty and for equal opportunity and better housing. As they mount new action programs, federal agencies turn to the universities for assistance. And the great demand, the overwhelmingly great demand is for counselors. The programs call for counselors to work for federal agencies, counselors to work on federally-financed university projects in the social action field. The demand is enormous--it seems as though the poverty program alone could swallow up every counselor we have.

Under the circumstances, university-government relations are bound to be somewhat strained. The surprising thing is that the relationship has been reasonably satisfactory.

But there are problems. Take one example. With its new responsibilities, the government desperately needs able professionals, not only counselors, but officials to administer research and training programs and all the rest. Yet, we on the campuses have done less than we should to persuade able people to enter government employment. Despite the new pay scales and the tremendously interesting jobs opening up in Washington, many professors are still advising their students to steer clear of the federal government. Not enough money, they say; too much dull routine and bureaucratic red tape. I have heard this within the week. Federal officials respond by calling professors haughty and theoretical and out of touch with reality. I have heard this too within the week.

So people who should work together, who must work together, still have some distance to travel on the road to true cooperation.

We at the universities have many complaints against the federal government. We feel that we do not receive full costs when we are asked to do a job for the government. We are consulted some, but not soon enough, in our opinion. Often we are not consulted at all on a new program; then we are asked to carry out a project we did not design and may not favor. There are endless delays when we submit applications; then we are told that we must act overnight. Late last spring we received a telegram at Wisconsin, asking us to mount a summer program to train counselors for a poverty venture. We did this with some difficulty, because our faculty had already made summer commitments; but we did it because we considered it a special emergency. This spring, after a full year available for planning in Washington, we again received the same telegram, late once more, breathlessly asking us to move at once.

Of course it works the other way as well. We at the universities complain that we cannot find our way around Washington, with its many overlapping, competitive, and poorly coordinated agencies. Washington officials in turn do not know what individuals to contact on our campuses (most of us handle federal relations casually and inefficiently). Working with a team of two or more universities is even more difficult, the government people say as hard as making an international alliance. The representatives of bureaus here in Washington, working under time pressure, further state that many professors are too leisurely or indifferent, and do not turn out nearly as much work (or as many counselors) as they should.

But, as I have said, these complaints should not make us forget our main point. We of the universities and the government have tackled a tough job; and, working together, are doing reasonably well. To bring improvements, what we need are more conferences like this one.

SOME ASPECTS OF HISTORY*

by

John G. Darley, Professor
University of Minnesota

Dating from the second World War, and within a broad definition of the behavioral sciences, higher education and the Federal Government have experienced intensified relations in research and training activities. The main thrust of these developments has been to shape locally controlled educational facilities in the task of meeting accelerated national needs for trained personnel and new scientific knowledge.

The written record will show that on balance I have viewed this evolutionary process as productive of important social advances:

> No major university today, public or private, engaged in graduate teaching and research can maintain its statue without the present partnership with the Federal Government. Conversely, the broad needs of the government for the end products of science make it equally dependent on the major universities and colleges maintaining the advanced programs.

Further:

> It seems to me that the past decade has witnessed the acceleration of a trend that has had a very long evolution in the United States: this evolution may be described as the mobilization of science and technology in the national interest. The phases of this evolution and its high points are written large in the following examples: the Morrill Act of 1862, creating the land grant institution; the National Academy of Sciences founded by Abraham Lincoln; the National Research Council of World War I and Woodrow Wilson's time; the many congressional acts relating to agricultural research and service; the OSRD and NDRC of World War II; the ONR, the RDB, and the National Science Foundation which came on the scene after World War II. (Darley, 1957)

---

*In the preparation of this paper, I have received invaluable assistance, documents, and background information from many of my colleagues in government agencies. My abiding appreciation for their cooperation, in this and other instances, implies no responsibility on their part for what I shall say in the paper, however. My thanks then to: Miss Cecile Hillyer, Ralph Bedell, James Garrett, Cecil Peck, David Pritchard, Joseph Samler.

And to certain University associates I am also indebted for aid, comfort, and suggestions: Willis Dugan, Lloyd Lofquist, John McGowan, E. G. Williamson.

To these major legislative landmarks in the area of research and development must be added several other examples of "action" legislation: Public Law 16; Public Law 346 (the "G.I. Bill"); the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954; Public Law 550 (the Korean G.I. Bill); Public Law 85-864 (NDEA); the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the legislation aimed at mental retardation (Public Law 88-164); and most recently, the anti-poverty legislation and the legislation providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. Lack of time precludes detailed analysis of the total mass of legislation; it is well-known to many of you at this meeting, however, and I am concerned only with three general aspects of it: it is aimed at the amelioration of crucial social problems--problems not bounded by state lines; it has required cooperation from higher education mainly in providing or training specialized personnel for action program; and it has established a great variety and flexibility of Federal-institutional contractual structures. McGowan and Porter (1964) describe this history of Federal legislation affecting certain kinds of counseling activities in the public employment service, as one major example.

Another direct effect of much of this legislation has been to break up the educational oligopoly under which a small number of distinguished institutions had received a highly disproportionate share of Federal research money and produced a disproportionate share of graduate students at the Ph.D. and Masters' levels. In essence, the legislation brings on to the production lines of higher education increasing numbers of institutions to participate in both training and research. Whether this results in a "lowering of standards" or a diffusion of necessary advanced education to a greater number of individuals or an overemphasis on tricks of the trade and mere technique training cannot yet be determined.

Very few will quarrel with the ends of this legislation. A nation that has acquired outstanding power on the international scene cannot lag in technical and scientific progress; a great research and development enterprise is essential in the world today. A nation that seeks the widest distribution of resources and opportunities for its citizens must act with compassion to eliminate injustice and ameliorate conditions of deprivation to the end that each individual may achieve his full potential. A nation can wait only so long for the tradition of state's rights to show that it can meet problems that transcend state lines. It is thus not the societal and individual ends that are in question.

But higher education faces two major problems today that must be made clear; one is quite general and one is specific to the theme of this conference. First, we run the risk of being killed with kindness, or at least smothered with affection, by various government agencies. Their expectations for us, their demands upon us, and the resources they hold out to us are completely understandable in terms of their executive or legislative missions. They need trained manpower for an increasingly complex and problem-oriented society. However, we in universities are beset by a few problems of our own. We are being flooded by massive enrollment increases at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Since higher education is essentially locally controlled, we must find municipal, state, or endowment resources as our first source of expansion of staff and physical plant. In the state sector of the economy, we must compete with increased needs in many other services and functions of government.

We are also competing in the tightest and toughest manpower market I have known in thirty years as an administrator. This competition is at the level of faculty, supporting staff and graduate students. Often our competitive problems are intensified by Federal government actions and grants aimed at enhancing the stature or capability of other institutions in the higher educational network. While government support may have increased the number of people seeking and completing advanced training, it is equally true that demand continues to outrun supply, and the net result may be a game of "musical chairs" in which competent or visible people merely become highly mobile. If this is true of well-established institutions, it will be even more true of institutions in the second and third ranks that must also meet enrollment and staffing problems.

We have not yet devised sufficient educational technologies to spread our available manpower over larger numbers of students or to distribute supervisory loads over larger numbers of working staff at lower levels. In the simplest form, there may not now be enough good institutional staffs to do all that the Federal Government expects in training; a variant of Gresham's Law may come to mark the products of such widely divergent training centers; the graduates of some specialized training programs may not be up to the demands and requirements that society and current legislation place upon them.

Our second problem, specific to the theme of this conference, deals with the name and nature of counseling. As my colleague, Dr. Brayfield has pointed out:

> Vocational counseling today is an officially recognized instrument of our national policy in social welfare and national security. By federal legislative enactment, administrative action, and operational example our government has extended recognition and support to vocational counseling. (Brayfield, 1961)

This is evident in the earlier G.I. Bill, in the work of the Employment Service, in the field of Vocational Rehabilitation, in the present program of the Veterans Administration, in the NDEA, and most recently in the anti-poverty legislation. Conant looks to counseling as a major solution to the problems of improving secondary education (Conant, 1959); the panel V report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (1958) stresses its essential character; even a recent showing of the General Electric "College Bowl" urged the young viewing audience to visit their wise and experienced high school counselors in seeking solutions to a wide range of problems.

As a one-time working counselor, I am, of course, delighted in a nervous sort of way, at the faith that everyone seems to have in the process and in its exemplars or representatives. But since my colleagues and I seem unable to agree on what the process is, who is most capable of carrying it out, how personnel should be trained in it, who can qualify for it, and how many counselors are needed for what kinds of programs, I admit to being more nervous than pleased. And when the universities are asked to train people for this field in courses as short as six weeks, with little control over their later futures, I become more scared than nervous.

There will be five work-study papers presented at this meeting; each will deal with important and specific aspects of this problem of definition, function, and training for counseling personnel, and I look forward to seeing the solutions and guidelines laid down in them. But I am less than hopeful for a full resolution of our problems, since we in higher education do not, and possibly should not, entirely determine society's needs and definitions for welfare service personnel except in a few highly structured and historically older professional endeavors. Furthermore, the confusion that attends the definition and scope of counseling is in part a testimony to our success as counselors, in part an outgrowth of our attempts to meet needs of individuals, and in part a result of the competition of the marketplace for all the helping professions. As Schofield (1964) points out in regard to the field of psychotherapy, we may, in the very process of trying to provide more counseling, be creating a demand that we can never satisfy with the available supply of qualified counselors.

Given these broad considerations, let me indicate briefly, as a case history, some of Minnesota's experiences in training counseling personnel. The record goes back to 1931.

Then some of us worked in the Employment Stabilization Research Institute, which had a slight influence on the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 and later developments affecting counseling in the public employment service, under joint Federal-State control. In the late 1930's, as consultants to the Cass County, North Dakota school system, we tried to support counseling personnel under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act affecting vocational education; we failed, I might add. Professor Donald Paterson, instrumental in all these activities, also helped establish a vocational guidance service in the Minneapolis Board of Public Welfare in this same period. As World War II drew to a close, the University maintained one of several VA contract counseling centers in Minnesota. In 1946, we were briefly involved with the Retraining and Reemployment Administration of the Department of Labor; I have been unable to find out when this operation disappeared from view on the Federal scene.

We have held continuing grants or arrangements for training clinical psychologists since about 1947, both with the Veterans Administration and with the National Institute of Mental Health. We have also been an APA-approved center for training counseling psychologists, with VA support, since 1952. Since 1955, we have had grants for the training of rehabilitation counselors and for research and demonstration projects with the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and its predecessor office. We have been engaged in the training of school psychologists in an inter-departmental program at the M.A., Specialist, and Ph.D. levels since 1958 with NIMH support. We have had NDEA counselor training institutes during the summer and during the full school year since 1959, and in addition have had trainees at the graduate level under Title IV of NDEA in fields relevant to educational research and counseling.

In 1964, at the invitation of the Secretary of Labor, Minnesota undertook a Project Cause training project. Our staff has also been involved in the evaluation and assessment process for Peace Corps trainees at Minnesota and elsewhere. For several summers, we have set up special short courses for the training of employment service personnel under arrangements with appropriate state or regional office. Many of these activities have been coordinated or intergrated with our regular graduate programs at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels for the training of counseling personnel; others have required us to keep the trainees in special groups and facilities, independent of our ongoing graduate work.

This brief listing is not intended to confer any special virtue on the University of Minnesota; our sister institutions have had comparable experiences and have responded equally extensively to the needs for training helping personnel, broadly defined and at several levels. I cite the list only to indicate that we can speak on University-Federal relations from exhaustive and sometimes exhausting experience.

Several government reports also exist in the literature that well describe the broad sweep of these various programs across many participating institutions. It is to the credit of many dedicated Federal professional staff members that these documents provide a clear history of the use of counseling personnel at various levels; set forth patiently ways of upgrading such personnel; and record the problems and difficulties in the various programs, often by using outside experts for critical analyses of what has been accomplished.

Let me refer to reports on four major programs for the provision of counseling services throughout the country. These are: the counselor training institutes of Title V-B of NDEA; the program of counseling in the Veterans Administration; the rehabilitation counseling work of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration; and the provision of counseling services in the United States Employment Service program. In terms of impact, investment, social need, and recorded history, they are the most important examples of the problems that must be worked out in Federal-University relationships.

Tyler (1960) provides an excellent and detailed analysis of the first 50 summer institutes for the training of high school counselors. In 1959, over 2,200 high school personnel were enrolled in these 50 programs. In reviewing some of the professional issues, Tyler mentions: the problems of the training centers in providing adequate staffs side-by-side with their regular graduate programs; the dangers in assuming that the summer institutes produce fully-trained counselors; the conflict between the definition of counseling by school administrators on the one hand and professional workers in counseling on the other; the possible distortion of emphasis stemming from the concern of NDEA for high-ability students. In this connection, she says:

> There is no difference in philosophy and attitude between counseling for the gifted and counseling for the average or retarded, but somewhat different kinds of knowledge and skill are involved. (page 78)

At the 1956 annual meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, a series of papers was presented on the counseling programs of the Veterans Administration. These papers have been reproduced in Information Bulletin 7-112 of the Department of Veterans Benefits. The paper by McCully reviews the history of the program and deals with the problems of upgrading the work of counseling personnel, often in the face of considerable difficulty. The paper by Feder, Super, and Williamson reports on the evolution of the program as seen through the eyes of the members of the Advisory Committee appointed by the Veterans Administration. As parts of the counseling program moved from Vocational Rehabilitation and Education in the Department of Veterans Benefits to the hospitals under the Department of Medicine and Surgery, the Program Guide for Vocational Counseling, published by that Department under date of August 8, 1960, spells out in detail the status, functions, and illustrative programs for counseling psychologists. In the VA program the emphasis has been on fully-trained counselors at the Ph.D. level, if possible. Dr. Cecil Peck, in a personal communication, recently indicated that the Department of Medicine and Surgery presently employs 278 Ph.D. psychologists performing counseling functions, in addition to the staff of clinical psychologists.

The strength of the present program in the VA must be seen in comparison to an earlier analysis of the VA contract centers, as a "crash" program at the end of World War II. Writing then, Darley and Marquis (1946) made the following statement about University involvements:

> This report does not reflect an encouraging outlook regarding the services of psychologists in this program. When the VA turned to the colleges and universities for help, many institutions responded and more will probably accept contracts. But in the main the operating staff seems to have minimum training in the psychological specialties basic to good guidance work. The institutions under contract are experienced primarily in smaller-scale personnel programs for their own students and the VA load even now is running ahead of the local load from which sound clinical experiences are derived. . . . Increased service loads will require additional staff member appointments, but the source of new staff members is questionable, since colleges, Civil Service and industry are bidding for the same types of personnel.

The Rehabilitation Record, published by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, in the issues of May-June 1960 and July-August 1964, provides excellent summaries of developments in rehabilitation counselor training, in funding research and development activities, and in working out collaborative relations with state rehabilitation programs. Since 1955 approximately 1750 individuals have completed graduate study in rehabilitation counseling; in 1962 a follow-up study showed that about 60 percent of graduates were employed in state rehabilitation agencies. It is to be noted that the training support program of the VRA has not been aimed primarily at the production of Ph.D. graduates in the area of rehabilitation counseling; the emphasis has focused on programs of advanced study of two years beyond the undergraduate degree, with appropriate internship and practicum experience built into the work. VRA has also given serious study by grant support to its problems of recruitment of counseling personnel, as seen in the report of the National Rehabilitation Association on counselor recruitment (NRA, September, 1964).

Employment office counseling is the last area to be mentioned in this partial analysis of government documents. As indicated earlier, McGowan and Porter have prepared a major handbook on employment counseling for the Missouri Division of Employment Security (McGowan and Porter, 1964). They speak to the issue of improving counseling services in this way:

> Over the past six years, Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator, Bureau of Employment Security, has issued a series of Administrative Letters related to upgrading Employment Service counseling services. These recommendations represent federal policy. However, it is still the responsibility of state administrators to evaluate their own needs and implement the recommendations. . . .

Later, speaking of the professional identity of counselors, the authors point out that ". . . of over 3,000 Employment Service Counselors eligible for membership in NVGA, less than 200 are members." They urge the establishment of a National Employment Counseling Association within the federated structure of the American Personnel and Guidance Association as a means of improving the total program of employment counseling in the country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the report of field visits to local and State Employment Service offices made under the auspices of the Panel on Counseling and Selection of the National Manpower Advisory Committee, entitled Counseling and Selection in the Manpower Training Programs (1965). In this report, serious deficiencies appear to exist in the quality of counseling provided in the employment service that will adversely affect the discharge of responsibilities under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. A Department of Labor report of 1963 (Manpower Development Program Highlights) reflects, on careful reading, some of the problems encountered in trying to get at crucial problems of unemployment and underemployment, by use of counselors in allocation of manpower for training assignments.

These reports, and many others that could be cited, are impressive testimony to the hard work of Federal and State personnel in fulfilling missions laid down in Federal legislative acts. It is possible to derive from them some idea of the stresses and strains that have had to be met when the Universities are sought out as partners in the enterprise. I shall try to illustrate these in the paragraphs that follow; in so doing, I draw not only on the official documents, but also on University experiences--my own and others--over the past several years.

First, the earliest Federal support programs preempted the services of many of the ablest people and institutions in training and research activities. In research, the Office of Naval Research, the National Science Foundation, and then the National Institute of Mental Health had access, in that order, to the best people and leading institutions. In major training support, the Veterans Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery and the National Institute of Mental Health were earliest in the field. In both training and research or demonstration support, the NIH and VA programs were followed by the vastly expanded programs of the United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Department of Labor. Although the more recent Federal entrants to the field have shown gradual improvement as University personnel became aware of the opportunities they provided, these later programs involved, at the start, personnel and institutions that were not always in the first rank, and on occasion funds were so committed over time that the Federal agencies could not easily move to higher quality activities. Thus reasonable doubts may arise regarding the quality of first outcomes of the later Federal programs, even though the ends sought are crucial. The issue here is the universities' problems of staffing and support as increasingly heavier demands were placed upon them, and the priorities they assigned in meeting the demands.

A second major stress in the relations is certainly not under the control of the universities and too infrequently under the control of the Federal agencies. I speak here of state-Federal relationship and policies in hiring, paying, upgrading, promoting, and utilizing trained personnel. With respect to salaries only, a recent HEW publication (State Salary Ranges, 1964), using such employment classifications as employment security personnel, public health personnel, public welfare personnel, mental health personnel, and vocational rehabilitation personnel, illustrates the problem. Wherever Federal legislation provides joint Federal-state participation in ameliorative activities, the Federal government may draw up standards for personnel and for functioning; these standards then must filter through a state civil service structure, a state commissioner of administration, and a state program functionally and legislatively related to the Federal goals. So long as such wide variations continue to exist in state civil service standards, state salary schedules, and state utilization and upgrading plans for the categories of helping personnel, the universities will find it hard to attract their best students to such fields and will even with the best intentions, be somewhat less interested in their training than in the graduate training of individuals qualified for and able to get higher level professional or administrative jobs, in a tight labor market. Certainly the Federal administrative and executive agencies are aware of this problem, but they too are perforce enmeshed in the national legislative process by which ameliorative progress is slowly and painstakingly made in our society. In elementary and secondary education, the same problem exists in raising standards for school counseling personnel; 50 states and countless local school boards set standards usually below those held by the profession itself.

A third source of stress for the universities, under their current pressures, is the understandable Federal need for in-service or upgrading training of personnel presently employed, under special contractual arrangements during an academic year or in the summer months or under various extension conditions, including daily consultantships by faculty members. Rightly or wrongly, the universities place more emphasis on their regular, resident programs of instruction and on the traditional time and sequence factors associated with them. With an already overburdened faculty, with research grant money easily available outside the regular school year, and with dynamic curricular change in progress in all subject-matter areas, it becomes difficult to participate with high enthusiasm in programs of in-service or upgrading training. Writing on the adult education movement in the California high schools, Clark (1956) defines this issue as the problems of "organizational marginality" and "operating pressures" in an enrollment economy; universities and colleges may not consider such contractual plans as central to their main mission.

A fourth source of stress, relatively minor in nature and sometimes transient in nature, involves the red tape, surveillance, accounting and legal details that so often seem to accompany the newer Federal programs. Certainly all virtue and honesty do not repose in the faculties and business administrations of our universities and colleges; they are not incapable of fast fiscal footwork from time to time. But the buyer-seller relationships that older established Federal agencies have established with universities seem more amicable, more reasonable, and more often based on mutual trust than is true of the newer Federal programs. In part this stems from a philosophical difference between the grant and the contract; in part it reflects the differing goals of research project or program support on the one hand and training support on the other hand; in part it is tied to the "crash" nature of many of the short-term training activities required to implement the various Federal pieces of legislation. But there have been times when I was paranoid enough to believe the same suspicious fiscal and legal staffs were following me around from one Federal agency to another.

A fifth source of stress may be found in the excessive specificity of training requirements spelled out in some Federal programs. There is no science of curriculum-making, certainly, but University experience tends to indicate somewhat greater success with broader curriculum content rather than with content oriented toward a particular and often narrow job description. Usually the specificity accompanies the requirement that only a particular group be eligible for a particular training program, as in the NDEA summer institutes or the Project Cause trainees, or Peace Corps trainees. From the standpoint of the Federal agencies involved, these requirements appear reasonable in accomplishing their missions, but they place a double burden on universities that must maintain their regular curricular programs at the same time as they take responsibility for the specific programs for a separate group of students.

A sixth issue in Federal-University relations involves differing patterns of stipends, fringe benefits, and work-load requirements among the Federal support programs for advanced training. While this may not be a problem in the special institutes or training programs restricted to a particular group of students, all of whom are on the same stipend and fringe-benefit base, it is true of several of the programs supporting general graduate education in the behavioral sciences. The traditional teaching assistantships and other forms of work-required support tend to drop in value in favor of work-free stipends, and these in turn are graded by amounts of support in the perception of graduate students, rather than by their inherent value in the total graduate education program. The summed effects of this problem on the flow, allocation, and motivation of advanced students across the differing areas of manpower need is difficult to assess; certainly it provides headaches for University administrators trying to maintain the strength and integrity of various segments of their teaching and research enterprises. We have seen recently another aspect of this problem: a grant to a non-profit service organization led to its attempt to staff the project by hiring from us graduate students, only partially trained, already on trainee stipends from the same granting agency.

The creation of new Federal agencies and programs, the assignment of responsibilities to two or more Federal agencies simultaneously, and the resultant conflicts with old-line agencies at both Federal and local levels, however inevitable these actions may be in moving a society forward, can only complicate

University-Federal relations. Having survived two three-year tours of duty in the Washington jungle and having dealt with bureaucratic structures for many years, I am quite aware of the need and importance of bureaucracy and of the dedicated service in Federal agencies rendered by many of my colleagues in psychology during and since World War II. But I yearn somewhat wistfully for what my factor-analytic friends call simple structure, and I could wish at least for more effective coordination of effort in the great society toward which we jointly strive. Interagency committees are helpful, of course, but not when all representatives are concentrating on protecting the primacy of their own agencies! I have observed the same phenomenon, however, in University interdepartmental and intercollege committees, so my hopes here are tempered by experience. Two articals in the Reporter magazine touch on this issue (Reporter, March 25, 1965; April 8, 1965) as does a recent syndicated column by Sylvia Porter (Minneapolis Tribune, April 23, 1965):

> We have in recent years poured billions of tax dollars into a bewildering range of antipoverty, anti-dropout, anti-illiteracy schemes. Yet we have no solid evidence that our billions have been reducing poverty or the numbers of dropouts and illiterates. We now spend an annual $5 billion on federal-state welfare programs alone. Yet our relief rolls are at historic highs. At last count six separate federal agencies were running 41 separate federal antipoverty programs for which Congress appropriated $15 billion in fiscal 1964 alone. Yet the agencies themselves confess that frequently they haven't had the vaguest notion how each program meshed or conflicted. The shocking fact is that we have been fighting poverty blindly. We have had no yardstick to measure success or failure. Now an aggressive drive is under way to put our sprawling antipoverty war on a businesslike basis. The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, D.C., has a new Office for Research, Plans, Programs and Evaluations staffed by a brain trust of 33 economists, statisticians, programers--and Pentagon planners--backed by an IBM computer. The office is compiling--for the first time ever--facts from every government agency and major private organization involved in the war on poverty. It is astounding, but it is a fact that this is the first attempt to find out, as poverty chief Sargent Shriver says, "whether the government is getting its money's worth out of its antipoverty programs." We're probably heading for some big shocks--multi-billion-dollar ones.

Admittedly, the daily newspapers and the periodic magazines are not the best sources of information on societal developments, but these citations at least reflect a problem that universities have experienced.

A more pertinent aspect of this form of stress, however, warrants passing mention. The newer Federal agencies and programs often seem blissfully unaware of earlier experiences with University relations, in research and training support. No one now appears to remember Ira Scott's Manual of Advisement and Guidance, (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1945) prepared to implement, standardize, and improve counseling services to be provided under Public Laws 16 and 346 of the 78th Congress; yet such technical manuals, updated to meet today's needs, would be important devices in upgrading the newer counseling training programs now being mounted. The Employment Security Manual, Part II, chapters on employment counseling and occupational testing and related techniques could well have wider and more general distribution to training programs and to other Federal agencies involved with the procurement, training, and use of counseling personnel. Additionally, the documents, already cited, covering the history and programs of NDEA, VA, VRA, and the Employment Service should be required reading both for Federal administrators and University administrators. In these, and in other citations, evolving patterns of Federal-University relations have been spelled out.

What is crucially needed at this moment in our history is a permanent and powerful coordinating council, representing the major government agencies and the most experienced universities, to bring our history to bear on our present needs. Such a council, with sufficient power and appropriate working panels, could address itself to the following problems: the relevance and dissemination of available research on manpower, counseling, and psychometrics; areas of needed additional research; the coordination of government recruitment programs for limited supplies of trained personnel; the definitions of levels of counseling functions for various governmental goals; and the important communication devices that would transmit our heritage of experience in relation to present Federal missions and objectives.

Without such an attempt at coordination, we shall not profit sufficiently from our own history.

A final point of stress will conclude this discussion of Federal-University relations. This is the problem of the name and nature of counseling; I have already mentioned it earlier. Until we in the profession can agree, and can implement such agreement, on definitions of levels of counseling personnel, on functions for these various levels, and on minimal training requirements for various levels, we cannot truly help the Federal agencies out of their dilemma and we shall have no basis except a given institutional consensus, for accepting or rejecting an offer to participate in the training of counseling personnel, or for deciding at what level of participation a particular institution should operate, or for deciding by what standards institutional programs should be judged. Unless we can clearly demonstrate that counseling personnel below some level will truly endanger their clients' welfare, we shall have no basis for working toward standardization of state job descriptions and improvement of state salary schedules in an effort to upgrade the entire field. It is to be hoped that the working papers prepared for this conference will speak to these and related issues. A recent report on the problem appears under the editorship of Thompson and Super (1964).

It is appropriate in concluding this overview to consider future possibilities affecting the preparation and employment of counseling personnel. In the first place, the demand for such personnel will probably increase; as we look at school, community, and federal activities designed to improve man's lot, all the helping professions will require more members. In the second place, variations in patterns and amounts of training will probably continue, but one might hope that some of the excessive variation would be reduced if agreement can be reached on minimal standards. In the third place, additional sources of manpower supply will have to be tapped; here one looks hopefully for the return of trained women to the labor force. In the fourth place, training responsibilities at different levels will have to be assumed by various categories of institutions, provided that standardized training materials can be generated and widely distributed, either in the form of self-instructional or programmed material or in the form of visual demonstration material or in the form of training manuals. In the fifth place, some greater coordination and federalization of certain ameliorative activ-

ities must inevitably evolve in the decades ahead. In the sixth place, the crisis or emergency aspect of much that we are trying to do will phase out and we can work toward longer-range goals and more substantial development of fundamental and generalizable ways to train and utilize and supervise counseling personnel.

On balance, Federal-University relations have been effective and meaningful for society, in this area as in many others. The stresses and strains, great as they may seem, on a day-to-day basis and as we are propelled from one crisis to another, may also be seen as "growing pains." If, on occasion, the universities seem reluctant, recalcitrant, or uncooperative, it must be remembered that they fulfill many missions for society, that they are overburdened at this moment in history, that they move ponderously, and that by their very nature they must seek to be sure of the means by which they approach desirable social ends.

REFERENCES

Note: The following bibliography contains some "background" items not specifically cited in the text of the paper itself. However, all citations surveyed have been included, in the hope that they will be of use to some abler historian who may write in this complex field of Federal-University relations at a later date.

Brayfield, A. M. "Vocational Counseling Today" in E. G. Williamson (editor) *Vocational Counseling: a Reappraisal in Honor of Donald G. Paterson.* Minn. Studies in Student Personnel Work, No. 11. University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Clark, B. R. "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values: A Case Study." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 21, No. 3, June, 1956, Pp. 327-336.

Conant, J. B. *The American High School Today.* McGraw-Hill Co., New York, 1959.

Counseling and Selection in the Manpower Training Programs: Report of Field Visits and Recommendations by the Panel on Counseling and Selection of the National Manpower Advisory Committee. Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, U.S. Dept. of Labor, No. 9, January, 1965.

Darley, J. G. "Psychology and the Office of Naval Research: A Decade of Development." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 12, No. 6, June, 1957. Pp. 305-323.

Darley, J. G. "The Impact of Federal Support on Higher Education." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 14, No. 8, August, 1959, Pp. 480-488.

Darley, J. G. and Marquis, D. G. "Veterans' Guidance Centers: A Survey of their Problems and Activities." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. II, No. 2, April, 1946. Pp. 109-116.

Division of State Merit Systems, HEW. *State Salary Ranges of Selected Classes of Positions.* July 1, 1964.

Dugan, W. E. *Report of Project Cause.* University of Minnesota, 1964. Typescript.

Employment Security Manual, Part II, revised Chapter 4000 - Employment Counseling. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Washington, D.C. Transmittal Letter 892, dated October 11, 1963. See also Part II, revisions in Chapter 9000 - Occupational Testing and Related Techniques, dated June 30, 1961.

Fletcher, F. M. "President's Message." *Counseling News and Views*, Vol. 17, No. 1, March, 1965. Division 17, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Gordon, J. E. "The Concern for Cause." University of Michigan. Mimeographed.

McGowan, J. F. and Porter, T. L. *An Introduction to Employment Service Counseling.* Prepared for Missouri Division of Employment Security. University of Missouri, 1964.

National Rehabilitation Association. Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study, Final Report. Reprinted by Dept. of HEW, VRA, Washington, D.C. September, 1964.

Rehabilitation Record, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Vol. 1, No. 3, May-June 1960, and Vol. 5, No. 4, July-August 1964. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Reporter, "Can the Job Corps Do the Job" by Barbara Carter, Vol. 32, No. 6, March 25, 1965. Pp. 21-26. "Education's Muddled Bureaucracy" by Jonathan Spivak, Vol. 32, No. 7, April 8, 1965. Pp. 33-36.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Panel Report V of the Special Studies Project. The Pursuit of Excellence. Education and the Future of America. Doubleday Co., Garden City, New York, 1958.

Schofield, William. Psychotherapy: the Purchase of Friendship. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964.

Scott, Ira D. Manual of Advisement and Guidance. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1945.

Thompson, A. S. and Super, D. E. (editor). The Professional Preparation of Counseling Psychologists, Report of the 1964 Greyston Conference. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1964.

Tyler, Leona E. The National Defense Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Program: A Report of the First 50 Institutes. OE-25011, Bulletin 1960, No. 31. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Veterans Administration, Department of Veterans Benefits, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education. Developments of a Decade of V.A. Counseling: Professional and Policy Implications. Information Bulletin 7-112, June 29, 1956. Contains papers by Harvey V. Higley; C. Harold McCully; Daniel D. Feder, et.al.

Veterans Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery. Program Guide, Vocational Counseling. G-1, M-2, Park XVI, August 8, 1960.

U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Employment Service. Manpower Development Program Highlights, No. 4, July 1963.

REACTIONS TO DR. DARLEY'S PAPER

DARLEY'S "SOME ASPECTS OF HISTORY" FROM THE VANTAGE POINT OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

by

James F. Garrett, Assistant Commissioner
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

All of us appreciate very much the thoughtful, perceptive paper prepared by Jack Darley. I am equally sure, however, that those of us representing Uncle Sam thought that he had prepared a paper presenting our own problems. The interchange of government for university and vice versa in his remarks would probably apply equally well. This demonstrates for me the remarkable interrelationship and, in large measure, cooperation between government and universities in counselor preparation and supply.

Fortunately or unfortunately, depending upon your viewpoint, government workers - despite appearances - do not operate as "free agents." So they must function within a legal frame of reference which is not always of their own choosing. This legal frame of reference in addition relates itself to a social philosophy which Dr. Darley has pointed up very well, particularly in the first few pages of his paper. This philosophy may be one with which one can agree - or again, cannot. For example, when the 1954 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act were being considered, one influential congressman felt that anyone could be trained to be a counselor in three months! So, when one questions our present (soon to be removed!) two-year limitation on any one course of study, let him remember what could have been!

Rather than react within time limits to all of the fine points made in the paper, I should like to make some historical and operational remarks about our own program to bring out one facet of university-government relationships, alluding to Dr. Darley's paper only in parts.

First of all, ours is one of the older of the newer programs refered to, coming into being late in 1954. In its genesis we had two advantages, one, a job analysis of the job of the rehabilitation counselor in State vocational rehabilitation agencies as he actually works, thus cueing us in to the knowledges and skills required to perform this role and second, a wide array of professional groups who felt they knew how he should be trained. Instead of ignoring this sage advice one could get "for free," as some Federal agencies in their "wisdom" have done, we asked politely and got more than we bargained for - a consensus. Bravely we asked NVGA, APA, the Council on Social Work Education, and the practitioner group, the National Rehabilitation Association, to meet with us using Rusalem's job analysis as the basic data and see whether we could agree on how to train and what to teach in this field called Rehabilitation Counseling. As might be expected, "many roads lead to Rome" - each discipline modestly indicated that it could offer the core areas plus the supervised practice and produce a first-class counselor. This was not the narrow training Dr. Darley referred to - as a matter of fact, it was so broad some kind souls even questioned whether the end product was, in fact, a counselor! Be that as it may, we found this advice so stimulating that, ten years later, we are still following it. Not that the training programs have not matured over this time period! What I mean is that we have left to the university where the program will be based (thus eliminating the bias of the Federal bureaucrat to whom Dr. Darley refers so politely) while at the same time holding the university responsible for the educational soundness of the program. Moreover, we still maintain a multidisciplinary training panel, with all the ingredients of university rehabilitation counselor coordinators, representation from the professional groups and the field of practice, with university administration thrown in for good measure. The latter group have been brought in to our deliberations because we are so conscious of what Dr. Darley has pointed out, i.e., what effect does a program such as ours have on the practices of the university, its commitments to us, and to other similar programs. We feel extremely fortunate in the high quality and dedication of those who have served on this panel and I would like here to acknowledge their wonderful contributions.

In line with this policy, we have also seen the need for constant surveillance of our program to see that it is apace of the times. To coordinate theory and practice, we have yearly held joint meetings of the University Rehabilitation Counselor coordinators and their staff with the States Council of Vocational Rehabilitation Director's Committee on Training. Sessions which started out as stormy, suspicious and acrimonious now seem relatively cooperative, helped no doubt by a year-round Joint Liaison Committee. It is our firm belief that cooperation and improvement is best fostered through positive and frequent exposure.

One result of this has been a much greater involvement of the universities in the continuing education of vocational rehabilitation counselors. We have tried to break down the frequently artificial barriers between in-service, pre-service, and post-service training by having the rehabilitation counseling coordinator and his staff involved in all aspects of counselor preparation. While the devices may be contracts for special institutes, we have tried, with greater or lesser success, to encourage continuity. Thus, under the vocational rehabilitation program, grant support will go for the basic professional training program, for assistance to the regional-State training council, for the State in-service training program, and for specialized courses, all involving the rehabilitation counseling coordinator. It is hard for us to see how the university person can offer a well-rounded basic professional training program unless he is thoroughly conversant with all aspects of counselor functioning and the agency in which he functions. These two, as much as some people would like to think otherwise, cannot be divorced.

Moreover, we are going to talk a good deal here about various levels of delivering counseling services. If we do, we must realize that this means a new work environment in the agency, one committed to continuity of training and a developmental atmosphere. Thus there must be a commitment to the growth of the individual on the job. How can the university hope to make a contribution to this new frame of reference unless its staff now are involved in the total process.

Much has been said of the university consortium in the undergraduate and graduate arena, and Jack Darley may have had that in mind when he talked of the various categories of universities (whatever value judgment that connotes) and their role for different levels of training. But I would like to suggest that, at least from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration standpoint, we should be focusing on the community consortium for our training - the integration of university, community agencies and individuals in that community for the most effective and meaningful training and service program. Here is our continuity - and this is not far off in reality so far as VRA is concerned because we already have fourteen research and training centers involving universities and community agencies in affiliation offering integration of teaching, research and client services. In this way too, the university can best discharge one of its responsibilities, that of up-grading the profession of counseling. All too often it is forgotten that some Federal agencies, by law, are forbidden to have anything to do with qualifications or conditions of work of those employed by State or local agencies, so this must devolve upon the professional associations and the universities.

As we look at the universities, I think we can all agree with Darley's clarion call for less red (a poor word) tape and more mutual trust. I should like to remind all of us, however, that mutual trust is based on mutual respect and that the latter usually develops from experience over a time span. Newer programs cannot expect the same treatment in universities as older ones. At the same time this is a free country and no one forces universities to apply for Federal funds. Those who accept them must also realize the mutuality of the situation and gauge not only what is in it for the university but what they can contribute to the mission of the granting agency. The same applies to coordination - there is need for coordination among governmental granting agencies (and there may be more than meets the eye!) but there is also need for similar good works and intentions at the university level - we all work hard but 200 percent of one's time is difficult to account for.

So it would appear we have much to learn from each other - and learn we must if counseling is to meet its social expectations and survive. Hopefully, in a paraphrase from Walter Lippmann, the more perfectly we understand the implications of counseling, the easier it will be for all of us to live with it.

GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS: THE POSITIVE SIDE OF STRESS

REACTIONS TO DR. DARLEY'S PAPER

by

Arthur L. Harris
Associate Commissioner of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The Federal Government and the universities have had long and harmonious relationships. Though not exactly "marriages" some of these relationships have been fairly consistent and permanent; others though not "flings" have been temporary and of an emergency nature. All have been fruitful. Dr. Darley describes the services performed by the universities for the people of the nation in his paper "Some Aspects of History," to which we are reacting today. He is to be congratulated for competently setting forth the many roles the university has performed for the Federal Government--especially in the area of training counselors during the nation's growth--during its years of crisis. The record is impressive, but, as Dr. Darley points out, it is not without "stresses."

And that, I take it, is why we are here today, to talk about these stresses, and I suppose identify or reaffirm some of the things that can be done to ameliorate them.

Dr. Darley is concerned that some of our newer relationships are not as happy as the old; that the universities "run the risk of being killed with kindness." It is indeed time, then, for dialogues such as this one. We need to think through what is happening. As a reactor, my role will be somwhat defensive. As suggested by the title, I will discuss the positive side of stress. I will, I hope, be as candid and fair as Dr. Darley has been in his paper.

Dr. Darley had described six stresses: 1. Diversion of university personnel to Federal programs at the expense of the regular university programs. 2. Disparity in salary and personnel practices. 3. Demands for inservice training. 4. Increase in red tape and legal tangles. 5. Excessive specificity of training requirements. 6. Differing patterns of stipends, fringe benefits, and work-load requirements, with resulting competition among Federal agencies and need for coordination.

Obviously, these stresses exist. We cannot argue that they do not, or even, in most cases, that they are minimal. The universities have some real problems, problems caused in large part by the Federal Government's need for the services of the universities. I will react to them in the order in which Dr. Darley presented them.

First, regarding diversion of personnel, one representative of a large university recently put it this way. He said that the medical school was losing its instructional talent through retirement. In other words, that only the older faculty members cultivated and practiced the skills of teaching, that the newer members were absorbed in government-supported research. Without question, it has not been the concern of the Departments of Defense, of Labor, of Health, Education, and Welfare or of other agencies when requesting training or research services to make certain that the university's total education program is well balanced. Nor is it the responsibility of individual government contractors to worry, for example, about any de-emphasis of the arts and humanities programs that might be caused by their activities. Though the university may complain of the allure of Federal funds and lay the blame of imbalances on government contracts, it seems to me that prevention is still in the hands of the university administration. Certainly like any virtuous lady, they should know when to say "No." The Government is not asking the university to divert its resources, it seems to me; it is asking for a service that the university alone can provide. But quite apart from this, where else would we have the Federal Government turn for these services? Traditionally, the university has been the intellectual bank for the nation. Indeed the university has carefully cultivated this role and --I might add--performed it well. Would those who complain of the diversion suggest that the Government develop its own resources--perhaps by establishing a national university? I think not.

Another stress, the disparity of salary and personnel practices among the States and local schools, is a problem about which, as Dr. Darley suggests, the Government and the university can do little. One theoretical solution to the problem (much too drastic) is the establishment and enforcement of Federal salary standards.

Another solution has already evolved, the use of university consultants on a part-time basis to carry out the inservice education needed locally and on the State level. The States do need the university services and the expertise--much of it incidentally developed through Government-supported research and training programs.

But Dr. Darley's third source of stress would preclude even that. He says that "With an already overburdened faculty, with research grant money easily available outside the regular school year, and with dynamic curricular change in progress in all subject-matter areas, it becomes difficult to participate with high enthusiasm in programs of inservice or upgrading training." Again this attitude is understandable, and may be universal. But I suggest that participation by our universities in State and local inservice education is part of their basic strength as institutions. Further, participation provides an opportunity to apply results of some of the research universities do. It would seem that the university has much to gain, and little to lose, by keeping this liaison. This kind of activity is, after all, a two-way proposition, both parties benefit. I know of university personnel who, as a matter of policy, take positions at the local level--school or community business--in order to keep their practice in the lab and classroom more than theoretical.

Dr. Darley speaks of a fourth source of stress--red tape, etc.--as relatively minor in nature and sometimes transient. I'm sure Dr. Darley realizes that he doesn't soften the blow by calling red tape "minor." (It's the color that hurts.) In defense I can only repeat what we all probably know. And this is that new programs are often faced with this red tape charge when they are getting started. Problems of new personnel, new procedures, and new relationships beset most new operations. However, our experience has been that after the first or second go-around these problems and some of the charges disappear. Perhaps this is why the older programs seem "more amicable, more reasonable" than the new. Of course, a government agency can never escape the ever-present obligation to operate strictly in the public interest, to do whatever we can to see that the tax dollar is spent, in the words of President Johnson, in ways that assure us that every Federal dollar buys a full dollar's worth of service. And we all must continue to report to Congress on the exact use of our funds. Many of the "probing, suspicious questions," I suggest, are in fact earnest attempts at evaluation.

The specificity (another source of stress) called for in many Federal programs aids us in this evaluation. That specificity is usually built into the law; any change in policy rests with the Congress, not with the administering agency. Congress has been interested in buying specific service. It has not been interested until recently in substantial support of the university.

Perhaps something can be done about the differing patterns of stipends, fringe benefits, and work load requirements mentioned as another source of stress. Coordination, of course, is the logical answer to this and other such stresses. In this regard, there have been several significant attempts at coordination.

First, the National Defense Education Act through its Title X authorized a survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education. The final report called for some mechanism for providing a general overview of the numerous educational programs scattered among many departments and agencies. But it noted that there is strong opposition on the part of both university and Federal administrators to the centralization in a single agency of the administration of the various Federal programs of higher education. But the Little report (as it is called) did recommend a centralized information service; a continuous and perceptive review of the panorama of Federally sponsored programs; comprehensive, systematic, and reliable nationwide studies of major trends and conditions affecting the welfare of colleges and universities; and studies of factors affecting full realization of educational opportunity among American youth.

Significantly, the U. S. Commissioner of Education at the direction of the President, today heads a coordinating committee that may well look into the sources of some of the stresses mentioned.

Meanwhile the Congress has moved to relieve the major strain on the universities--a strain that underlies all of the stresses mentioned here--the overburdening of faculty and facilities. It seems to me that the real solution to imbalances has been evident for years, indeed, has been advocated for years by educators and many Congressmen: that is, more Federal funds to colleges for the expansion of their faculty and facilities. Some legislation to this effect has recently been put on the books, some is proposed.

To increase the supply of college teachers, the NDEA fellowships authorization was increased last year from 1,500 to a maximum of 7,500 by 1966.

To increase college facilities we have the new Higher Education Facilities Act.

To increase educational efficiency, we have a greatly expanded cooperative research program.

By appropriating Federal funds for higher education, we are increasing our capacity to educate.

Such legislation does not cause imbalances or draw off personnel. One of the problems has been that the Federal government has taken more than it has given. This tendency seems to be easing. The only discussion now is whether the amount of Federal aid for the educational enterprise is enough to keep pace with the service demands from other agencies of the Government.

Finally, I suggest that not all stress is undesirable. It has a positive side. Stress is, after all, not always distress. In many cases when great demands are put upon individuals or/and institutions, they find that they can do more, and do better, and faster, what needs to be done. The challenge of meeting national needs, I submit has strengthened the universities, not just a few, but all across the land. In many cases the stresses revealed basic inadequacies in faculty and facilities--inadequacies that subsequently led to programs of strengthening.

Universities can take several roles, but I believe most of them would rather be identified as meeting the demands of society for change, rather than resisting it. Universities can become the repositories of knowledge; but it is just as important that they be the generators of change.

No one argues that the needs of the nation, as expressed through the Federal Government, have not put pressures--yes stresses--on the universities to take a dynamic role in the nation's future. But the universities have responded--and, on the whole, they are better institutions for it.

Some demands from Government probably should be resisted, for they may be unreasonable. However, if the college and the university respond for the sake of the funds involved, it is a bit unseemly that they should then cry "foul play,"--that their virtue has been sullied.

REACTIONS TO "SOME ASPECTS OF HISTORY," A PAPER BY JOHN G. DARLEY

by

Louis Levine, Director
United States Employment Service

I should like to take Dr. Darley's final point of stress -- the problem of the name and nature of counseling -- as the subject of my first comment. Definitions of counseling functions and levels, and agreement on these within the counseling profession, Dr. Darley contends, are a necessary first step before deciding how institutional programs may be developed to assist the Federal agencies in their task of securing specialized personnel for action programs. The nature of employment counseling, as defined by the Employment Service, I might point out, emphasizes the importance of the vocational plan as a part of counseling, the need for recognizing that the job market and occupational interests of the counselee are a part of a broader social and economic environment, the importance of taking account of the whole individual -- the counselee -- his traits, values, motivations, interests, and aspirations.

Technological changes in the nation's economy are presenting the counselor working in an employment office with complex new problems which he must understand and cope with effectively. The war on poverty has affected his role so that he is becoming more deeply involved in the sociological and anthropological aspects of the disadvantaged. He is being required to be more sensitive than ever before to manpower and human resources and their relationship to employability and job markets. As its horizons widen, the broad interdisciplinary nature of employment counseling emerges. More about this later.

The United States Employment Service recognizes that professional counselors cannot be produced by summer institutes, courses, and work shops, or any "crash" program limited to carrying out specific legislative mandates. It recognizes that the excessive specificity of training requirements spelled out in some Federal programs does not lead to the broad-gauged capacities which the truly professional counselor would hopefully possess.

What the employment service envisions is an adequate supply of well-rounded, professionally prepared counselors which the legislative mandates and the full needs of society require. It sees this supply coming about as the result of on-going programs in counselor preparation in institutions of higher learning throughout the United States. New counseling standards established by the United States Employment Service recognize that professional counseling requires the master's degree level of preparation. If such counselors are to be provided in the quantity which the new social imperatives demand, we must look to the universities to produce the supply.

Recognizing that the development of the counselor, as with any service professional, requires the application of theory as he learns it, I envisage the preparation of employment counselors through full-time, year-long study, associated with a practicum to provide him with appropriate internship experiences. This practicum I would see as under university supervision and utilizing State Employment Service personnel in various capacities in the training programs. The case for the desirability of such an arrangement is strengthened by the recent experience of the USES and a number of State offices in connection with employing high school counselors in local offices during the summer months. A number of States engaged in this program. Almost without exception the State agencies were enthusiastic with the results and recommended that the program be continued. The local offices found that the school counselors adjusted to their jobs with a minimum of training and that they had a wholesome influence on the attitudes and accomplishments of the regular office staff. The arrangement was hailed with equal enthusiasm by the school counselors themselves. They pointed out their increased awareness of what happens to the school dropout as he faces the world, better understanding of the job market and the problems facing job seekers, more realistic knowledge of occupations, and first hand experience in communicating with all classes of people, thus broadening their understanding of the world about them and the dynamics of its social forces.

The employment service had seen the local employment office itself as the ideal laboratory in which to provide counselor candidates with the internship experiences best calculated to fit them for their responsibilities as employment counselors. I think that the suitability of the employment office as the locus for the practicum in counseling was well demonstrated by the school counselor employment program.

One major stress in government-university relations to which Dr. Darley refers is the problem of lack of control by the universities and the Federal government over the hiring, paying, upgrading, promoting, and utilizing of trained personnel. Because standards established on the Federal level filter through State civil service structures and State administrations, producing wide variations from state to state in the qualification standards, State salary schedules, and State utilization and upgrading plans, the universities find it hard to attract their best students into employment service counseling. I would say that I see in the future a move away from State civil service and merit systems and an accelerating use of universities in recruiting good counseling candidates. I would hope that the universities and professional associations can give us maximum support in this intent.

To get anywhere in this direction the employment service recognizes that salary scales must be competitive and that at present they are not. It recognizes that the shortage of trained counselors is such that adequate training stipends must be made available to qualified individuals who will undertake full-time programs of professional preparation. It is putting its efforts squarely to the task of securing higher salaries and the granting of stipends in adequate numbers.

The emergence of the network of Youth Opportunity Centers within the employment service system is a response to the recognition that under-educated, unskilled, and under-privileged youth, if they are to be salvaged from hopeless adequate to a shared understanding of their view of the world. Perhaps one of the most important implications of the anti-poverty program is the need to reassess the traits, abilities, and understanding of counselors and others who are to serve disadvantaged people.

The traditional curriculum for counselor preparation may be seriously deficient in providing the information, analytical insights, and understanding of the environment and forces which most influence the outlook of the poor to whom the anti-poverty program is directed. That program requires people with the disposition to commit themselves to close and continuous involvement with culturally deprived people and their social environment. There is growing recognition of the significance of team work and the interdisciplinary approach to the resolution of problems confronting disadvantaged youth. Contributions from the techniques and insights of many specialties are required to solve these complex problems, as indeed is the case very often in serving counseling candidates from other special groups, including older people, physically handicapped, mentally restored, and even the mentally gifted.

This brings me again to a point I mentioned earlier, the recognition of the essential interdisciplinary nature of the counseling function and the need for the interdisciplinary training of counselor candidates. That the curriculum for the training of counselors involves preparation in interviewing and guidance with a heavy reliance on the behavorial sciences, especially psychology, is a sine qua non. However, for tomorrow's employment counselor, and ideally for today's, that is not enough. I would certainly concur with the American Personnel and Guidance Association in recommending that a counselor education program should assure that each counselor candidate has a background (undergraduate or graduate) in the humanities and in the social, behavioral, and biological sciences that help him to understand the behavior and adjustments of individuals and the nature of the world he lives in. I would see his basic science preparation as being no less comprehensive than James B. Conant has recommended for American teachers, which includes undergraduate courses in psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, biology, and more than one physical science. Much more needs to be done, probably on a graduate level, with those branches of economics and sociology which are most directly concerned with manpower and human resources and their relationship to employability and job markets. In preparing the employment counselor it must be remembered that he requires a personal knowledge of the world of work, the required qualifications, opportunities open, rewards and disadvantages of work, its values in the society, and style of living of the workers. It should be recognized that he needs the capacity to keep track of a great store of highly perishable job market information, not only in relation to an immediate locality, but frequently of a city, a State, and perhaps of the Nation, as the work force increases in mobility.

In connection with counselor preparation then, there is a tremendous job of establishing training programs in terms of both basic counseling theory and the practicums adequate to apply theory. To further complicate the undertaking, there is the need to make counselor education interdisciplinary. This is in no way to imply that it should be taken out of the control of counselor educators, but it does imply for counselor educators the rather delicate and difficult task of drawing instructors from outside areas of specialization and of introducing content from a variety of other disciplines into the counseling curriculum.

To accomplish these long range goals which I have discussed will require coordination between the government and universities, a communication and an understanding of each other's needs, and an agreement on these, so that university programs for counselor training and employment service counselor standards, levels, and functions can be meshed. The need for arrangements along this line will be a continuing one. With Dr. Darley I agree that the crisis or emergency aspect of what we are trying to do will phase out and has no real impact on the development of fundamental and generalizable ways to train and utilize counseling personnel.

REACTIONS TO "SOME ASPECTS OF HISTORY," A PAPER BY JOHN G. DARLEY

by

Cecil P. Peck, Chief
Psychology Division
Veterans Administration Central Office

From 1947 through 1951, I was a participant as a graduate student in a government supported training program. Since that time I have been directly and intimately involved with an increasing number of universities, presently 65 and possibly 70 in a few weeks, in a cooperative training endeavor for the preparation of doctorate level psychologists. This training enterprise has been, still is, and will continue to be a joint effort of cooperation between a Federal agency and universities. My remarks will be influenced by the experiential spectrum of direct face to face training supervision of graduate students, by numerous meetings with university faculty who regularly serve as training consultants, to regional and national responsibility for the professional and administrative aspects for training of psychologists. These experiences have led to a not so obvious conclusion, namely, that government-university training relationships are deceptively complex.

The complexity of this training relationship must be perceived within the framework of the mission and responsibility of the government agency and mission and responsibility of the university. Both share common problems, competition, and concerns which Dr. Darley has pointed out, e.g., supply of trained personnel, motivation and interests that persist through time, role identity and purposeful training, increasing manpower demands for training and educational opportunities along with such concrete issues as costs of training, types of training support, adequacy of space for training, etc. Such economic, environmental and psychological factors freely interact in a training relationship between the government agencies, which are largely a consumer, and the universities which are basically the producer.

While I have the floor I would like to comment that rarely have I seen such a group of excellently prepared and well-documented work-study papers. They not only will be of significant value for accomplishment of the mission of this conference, but will be increasingly valuable for training and evaluation purposes in future years.

A variety of governmental training support programs have existed for some years which have generated a need and unfilled demand for counselors under earlier legislative or administrative actions. Legislation during the past four years has accelerated the demand for counselors even further and has amplified the problem to a far greater magnitude. However, the problem is not appreciably different than that which has existed since the end of World War II. Characteristics of the problem are now being brought into more precise focus with the current legislation and include such factors as the nature of the work situation, identified responsibilities for effective work, defined responsibilities to a clientele and the mastery of a technology which is necessary to fulfill the responsibilities.

The clientele can also be characterized now as more representative of the nation's population than many of the earlier programs. It is the client and society to whom the counselor is responsible and not for whom he is responsible. Responsible professional and technical actions by counselors contribute to social change as a part of living in an increasingly complex social environment. Within the social charter of the time, counselor's actions are based on the desire for each individual to achieve his full potential.

The interdependency of the government and universities in fulfilling their responsibilities cannot be dismissed and was well stated early in Darley's paper. As a consequence, it is not infrequent to hear a university faculty member express an opinion that the government is too beneficent when it comes to providing resources (frequently with the contingency that certain training or research goals be achieved).

Darley's paper points out seven stresses that emerge when the government forms a partnership with a university in a training enterprise. The stresses cited are very familiar and they have not been easily or definitively resolved. Most of the stresses can be perceived as functions of a dynamic evolutionary process inherent in the training relationship as a part of the accomplishment of a more global mission and secondly, the stresses must be understood relative to the changing and emerging patterns of training and academic education.

Preempting of able people by government programs in specialized training and research endeavors was the first stress cited. This no doubt was true in the past and to some extent the problem still exists. However with joint planning in early phases of program development, clear identification of the mission and a working understanding of mutual responsibilities in goal achievement, such stress can be reduced. Such programming permits the development of a meaningful identity for both the university and the government and is most typical of long range training programs. Obviously crash programs and often contract programs by their very nature do not share such characteristics. Program development also includes the identification of training talent in universities and government agencies so that by mutual agreement a sharing of training responsibilities may emerge. With the manpower shortages, it is disquieting to not optimize the talent that is available. This does not mean that the educational responsibility is removed or reduced in the university.

The second identified source of stress is very realistic and in overt and covert ways has a disrupting influence in training and as well as in career work situations. This pertains to the remarkable variations and inconsistencies in governmental personnel policies and procedures. Issues such as career opportunities, pay, promotion, classification and qualification standards, etc., are critical factors in influencing the counselor and counseling student. They selectively influence students entering training, motivation for work in a specialty field, recruitment and holding power, and dampen enthusiasm of even the best intentions of a cooperating training university. Such factors are equally disruptive to both the long and short range training programs.

The third stress pertained to short term contractual programs for upgrading of government personnel. Certainly the need for inservice training is recognized. However, specialized training, short term training assignments, and other training opportunities can be provided and accomplished as a part of a longer range training program, using resources both within government and universities. Such will not produce fluctuating loads and responsibilities upon universities who have major education and training goals geared to longer range objectives.

The fourth stress mentioned pertained basically to fiscal accounting and legal issues that accompany government programs. Such issues exist in both government sponsored programs and in university administrative procedures. Simplicity of administrative structure, procedures and actions is called for on a mutual basis. Again longer term training programs have a built-in advantage. Assuming long term goals are defined and policies are established, routine governmental operational procedures can be modified with no major disruption of program definition or policy.

The fifth source of stress pertains to specificity of training requirements which are required in some governmental programs in counseling. Most persons in governmental programs would agree with Dr. Darley's thesis that the university is most successful in training with a broader type of curriculum content than content oriented toward a narrow specific type of technical training. Technical training in many respects can be provided in an internship or a modified type of internship appointment in the affiliated government institution. Such a procedure does not necessarily have to slow down the output of qualified counselors in that a known number of students are in this phase of training plus a larger group are involved in an academic program. Such an arrangement permits a better utilization of manpower in the government agency and the university, and should avoid overlap of training responsibilities to a large extent. It likewise implies there is a mutual training responsibility in which university faculty are resource individuals to the practicum agency which further enhances the identity in the training relationship.

The sixth issue pertains to different patterns of funding for students and the inherent requirements for work among the different Federal programs. This frequently is made to be an issue of great importance and is frequently cited by students to different university or agency program officials as a critical factor in acceptance or rejection of government training. Most frequently cited is the lack of a work requirement or a supervised training assignment with favor being given to work-free stipends. In spite of a difference in training opportunities and government requirements, plus the attitudes of students it is still very apparent that with the properly motivated student they will request and insist on being a part of a high quality training experience, an experience which is challenging, provocative and meaningful in purpose..

The last stress point pertains to the nature of counseling and the lack of agreement as to a definition of levels for counseling personnel. Although this is frequently discussed, its significance cannot be underestimated. A definition of a level or definitions of work levels are essential to plan for training of counseling personnel and the development of university-governmental training relationship. Without such, an agreeable relationship cannot exist for long. Obviously, such a problem must be identified and proposed solutions made before either a short term or a long range training relationship can be meaningfully implemented. This does not mean that there will be no variation in training patterns and that different institutions will train individuals differently.

On the part of the government program which has operating service responsibilities to clientele, certain very basic policies and support must be provided as a full partner in a training relationship. Obviously there must be consistent fiscal support for didactic training. Just as important, however, is full acceptance of the fact that a training philosophy must pervade the entire organization. This means literally that the government recognize that training responsibilities require the time of staff who might otherwise be providing services, that qualified training staff must be recruited and that space is needed. Operational responsibilities must be fulfilled, but there must be a willingness to make administrative decisions conducive to training and to live with the problems a training partnership requires. There must be a willingness to assume risk and to live with the failures in training on a mutual basis. A government-university training relationship requires mutual respect, confidence and a spirit of cooperation. Success and some failures are products of a joint training enterprise.

LUNCHEON ADDRESS

HOW AN IDEA BECOMES A LAW

by

The Honorable Wayne Morse
United States Senator, Oregon

Chancellor Schwada, Father Donovan, Dr. Hitchcock, distinguished guests and conference participants:

As I review the list of distinguished gentlemen and scholars who have preceded me today in your work sessions, I don't quite know whether I should pay my respects first to Wisconsin or Minnesota. Both share a large part of the blame for having directed me through preparation, guidance and counseling into becoming a lawyer, a dean, and finally a Senator.

Let this be a good lesson for you as you work with youngsters. Unless you do your work well, they may turn out to be legislators, and then you will have to live with the laws they make.

Undoubtedly the greatest counselor I had in all my academic work was a high school biology teacher in Madison, Wisconsin. Her name was Linda Weber. And I wasn't the only young person she helped; she helped quite a few to my knowledge including a young lady who was in the same economic status that I was as a high school student and who later became my wife. Neither one of us had the slightest chance of going to college. We came from homes that made that impossible without the type of assistance that this biology teacher made available to us and others. But I had a mother and a father who were insistant that I try to go to college, if at all possible, although they couldn't afford to send me. And so Linda Weber, who consulted with me in my senior year in high school, took out a life insurance policy on me as she did on other young people. Then using that as her security she loaned me the money to go on to college and, from time to time, money to stay in college where otherwise I would have been a sure-fire dropout. Now there are a lot of people that wish I would have dropped out, nevertheless, I stand before you today as one who was not only the beneficiary of sound guidance and counseling on the part of a very wise teacher, but also I stand before you as one who on the basis of that experience is determined that we nave the Federal Government do, in a large measure, what Linda Weber did. For there aren't very many Linda Weber's that are willing to provide the means that will enable young men and women to develop to the maximum extent of their educational potential. And I mean no flattery when I say to you counselors that I think American education owes you much in the lives that you save educationally as a result of your wisdom and your counseling.

The ideas, concepts, and backgrounds which you help to instill can rise to haunt you afterwards, of course. Try as you may, and I am sure Dr. Harrington, who appeared as a witness before my subcommittee on the "Higher Education Act of 1965" about two weeks ago, would be the first to agree that it is always more dif-ficult to redirect efforts than it is to channel them correctly in the first instance. But I am sure that Dr. Harrington would also agree that a good educator is not afraid of repetition as a teaching principle and he probably would prescribe to the philosophy that if at first you don't succeed, you must try, try again. I feel sure that with respect to our current legislation concerned with higher education and particularly the student assistance aspects of it, for example, the scholarship provisions of Title IV of S600, President Harrington is not too downcast over the legislative failure which has earmarked our efforts since 1958. In fact, since 1946 I have been either the cosponsor or the author of every major piece of education legislation introduced in the Senate. I was one of the cosponsors of the great Taft-Elender General Aid Bill of 1947, and we are still trying to put into legislative form some of the unpassed features of that bill. Many of them were, of course, in the Kennedy Omnibus Bill. Although let me say that out of the twenty-four items in the Kennedy Omnibus Bill, we now have taken action on Twenty-one of them. And, as I said at the time when I conferred with the President following some earlier defeats in regard to some phases of that bill, that although I did not think we had any chance of passing an omnibus bill, we still don't have any chance that we could step by step accomplish the end that he had in mind. And would that he were here to see me now, because he agreed with the advice that I gave him and gave up the idea of trying to pass an omnibus bill, agreed for me to segmentize it and take it through section by section. Would that he were here now to see what has been accomplished because of the trail that he blazed, and thus made it earlier for us to approach the goal.

So in my brief discussion of the legislative process and the interaction of the legislative and the administrative branch in carrying on of an authorized program, I shall, with your permission, sketch in lightly, first, the formal process of enacting a law, and, second, in greater seriousness, how it really is done.

Most of you are aware, I believe, that contrary to the general impression, the primary purpose of Congress is not to legislate. We go to extraordinary lengths to keep a proposal from ever being inscribed on the tables of the law.

First item: Unlike other systems, the Executive, under the Constitution may not introduce a legislative proposal. He must first convince a Congressman and Senator that an idea in draft form ought to be introduced. Even then, it need not be introduced in that form, or with the provisions in it, as submitted. Matter, at the discretion of the Senator or the Representative, can be added or substracted. This can lead to sudden rises in blood pressure on the part of the agency head who sees the printed form of the bill the day after it has been introduced.

Second item: When the bill is finally introduced, does the House or the Senate proceed to debate it? Indeed not. It is quickly hurried from the floor to the quiet of the appropriate committee, there to await re-referral to some subcommittee. Patient persuasion must then be employed to get it referred to subcommittee, to get the chairman of the subcommittee to schedule hearings, and with luck, to schedule an executive session to mark up the bill after it has been torn apart by witnesses who don't like it, and didn't the first time they had come across it several years before.

Third item: These hurdles having been surmounted by craft and compromise, a new group of Senators and Representatives, comprising the remainder of the two full committees, must be convinced that the public weal would not suffer if the bill were really enacted. This sometimes takes a good bit of time.

Fourth item: The Senate, as a body, then gets a chance to change, disrupt and distort the idea through floor amendments. The House is even more shy about passing a bill because they make the bill travel through an additional committee, the Rules Committee, before bringing it to the floor. This committee has the power of life and death over a bill.

Fifth item: After the bill has been changed, and probably modified at each stage, it finally passes the House and the Senate. The high probability is that the key provisions differ in detail, and one variant may have additional sections in it, while the other does not contain concepts because they had been struck in the various amending procedures to which the bill was subjected. Since a statute to be signed by the President must contain in reconciled form the final action of both House and Senate on identical language, either House or Senate must recede from their previous vote taken on the bill or the bill must go wearily to conference to iron out the problems. Almost, that is. If an objection is heard in the House, before the bill can go to conference it must go to the House Rules Committee to get a rule on the appointment of the House Managers. This may take time--quite a bit of time. Assuming that the House Managers and the Senate conferees can agree, the conference agreement is then sent back to the House and the Senate for final action.

It is by no means unheard of for either body to reject a conference report and order it recommitted with instructions for specific changes to be made. At this point, the chances are at least 50-50 that no more will be heard of the measure for that session. But let us be optimistic, and say that both House and Senate have adopted the bill in identical form and have messaged it to the White House.

In view of the changes which have been made, the President, in exercising his constitutionally granted legislative authority, may find that the bill should be vetoed on the grounds that it is in conflict, as finally written, with his program. Translated, this often means that it costs too much.

If it looks as though the veto would be over-ridden, the Bureau of the Budget may find that it no longer costs too much.

So much for the formal legislative process. I have spoken half in jest, to be sure, but there is the yeast of truth in what I have just detailed. Our system of government by men under the rule of law has, to use the Holmes-Laski phrase, a major unarticulated premise that those affected by law shall have an opportunity to be heard, and that which is to bind all should be approved by almost all.

What, therefore, actually occurs, since the Congress is a check on the executive and the people are a check on the Congress and the courts are a check on both executive and legislative, is that in each stage of the process there is active consultation and debate.

The proposals sent up by the President have been fashioned by the departments, whose lawyers and whose policy men are keenly aware of past performance in the particular legislative field.

Let me give you an example of what I mean, taken from the legislative history of the Perkins-Morse Elementary and Secondary Education Act, now P. L. 89-10.

Title I of P. L. 89-10 is an amendment to P. L. 874, the impacted area operations and maintenance act of 1950, which carries a price tag of $1.06 billion approximately. The money is distributed to the schools through a formula based upon two major factors--census data on low-income family children and 50 percent of state per-pupil support of education in all public elementary and secondary schools.

To understand the "what," "how," and "why" of P. L. 89-10, we need to look at the roots, the preliminary activities, the forerunner bills, which though they never became law, nevertheless helped to shape and refine the concepts which at long last prevailed.

Let me take you back to the 87th Congress. In that period the Senate debated and passed S. 1021, the original Kennedy elementary and secondary public school bill. While it did not get through the House of Representatives, during our debate you may remember, I urged its passage on the grounds that such legislation of a general aid nature had already been approved in principle through enactment of P. L. 815 and 874, the impacted area bills of 1950. What I pleaded for at that time was that the Federal Government recognize its responsibilities to a much broader segment of schools which were impacted with youngsters. These schools, I said, need our help as much and more than the schools educating more than a third of our young people.

Well, S. 1021 met the fate of legislation ahead of its time, but a two year extension of the impacted area laws winged through without much trouble.

In the 88th Congress, S. 580, the omnibus education bill, was submitted by the Administration. Among its provisions were modifications of impacted area statutes and proposals to concentrate Federal aid in school districts most in need of having the quality of education provided greatly improved. Bill after bill was carved from S. 580 and became law. Higher education facilities construction, amendments and improvements to the National Defense Education Act, broadening of aid and the addition of construction to public libraries, expansion of vocational education authorities with greatly expanded funds authorizations. Again, riding on the NDEA amendments was the extension of P. L. 815 and P. L. 874. But the improvement of quality concept didn't take fire.

There was a message here, I felt. So I asked the staff of my committee to review the legislation to see what we could do to crack the barriers. A year ago last February, I was invited to discuss the problem with educators in a morning work session similar to this conference here in Washington.

I told them that as the result of the study we had made, I felt that we could get the legislation that we all wanted, provided we cast it correctly in a form familiar to Congress, which meant as an amendment to existing law, and in a form which would have a political sex appeal to a wide spectrum of Congressmen. I felt we could get Administrational approval from a budgetary standpoint. I told them that while I was just as strong for a general aid bill as ever, it probably couldn't be enacted yet. While keeping to general aid as a long range objective, I suggested that we should try to unite on legislation which would approach what we wanted on a categorical use basis.

I showed them a draft of a bill which I had worked out with my staff and with legislative counsel, which I later introduced and held hearings on as S. 2528.

This bill proposed to amend P. L. 874, the impacted area bill, by adding two new categories of children, those on whose behalf an aid for dependent children payment under the Social Security Act was being made, and those whose parents were in receipt of unemployment compensation in areas where there were many unemployed.

I will never forget those hearings last summer. To my astonishment the Administration, speaking through the mouth of the Commissioner of Education, pleaded against enactment on the grounds that my bill cost too much and on the grounds that there would be administrative difficulties in working out the formula provided.

Now I conduct my hearings in the form of a seminar, with term papers assigned to the Administration witnesses. So I told the Commissioner, more in sorrow than in anger, that, in my judgment, he had flunked the course. And I made him my emissary to the Administration to tell it, all the way to the top, that they had failed it, too. But I held out hope. I told the Commissioner that he could repeat the course for make-up credit in this session.

Last fall during the signing of the Powell-Morse National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964, the Commissioner came over to me and said, "Senator, the President wants us to tell you that we are for your bill. We are even going to expand it. We don't know by how much, but we are going to expand it."

The rest is history. Instead of my little $218 million a year bill, they took me at my word and increased it fivefold, when they sent up S. 370 and H. R. 2362.

When we talked with the Health, Education, and Welfare people and the Office of Education people about the bill prior to its introduction last January, we had a great deal of fun with them, pointing out how much time and effort they could have saved themselves. But seriously, the key point consisted in finding a formula which was (1) objective, (2) verifiable from independent sources without too great an investment in personnel and (3) most importantly, which was based on forerunner legislation which was known to Congress so that the strawmen such as the myth of Federal control could be laid to rest. This helped us to build a bridge across the chasm which had swallowed up every Federal aid bill since 1947.

So much for the origins of Title I. When the Perkins-Morse bill was about to be introduced, Carl Perkins and I met in my office to see how best we could move to avoid the other serious problems we both knew would face the legislation. We agreed upon our strategy and instructed our staffs to work in closest harmony as the two versions of the bill moved through subcommittee.

Since Carl and I had worked very closely together on the vocational bill and since we saw things the same way in conference on the NDEA bill of 1964, we were able to come up with a pattern of operation so successful that because of changes which were made in the House subcommittee, our road, particularly in the very delicate church-state area in the Senate, was greatly smoothed.

Had Carl run into insuperable difficulties on the House side, then instead of H. R. 2362, we would have pushed ahead with S. 370 and reconciled differences in conference. But our previous experience with conference action where formulas and where church-state issues were involved made us want to avoid this course, if at all possible.

As you know, the plans we laid in January matured well, and despite exceedingly attractive diversionary thrusts--from both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Hill--we were able to muster the majorities necessary for enactment of the Perkins-Morse bill.

I may not be the world's greatest authority on higher mathematics, but after 20 years in the Seante, I think I can count political noses, because without that faculty the best written bills never become law. Differences between men of good will ought to occur so that the principles upon which legislation are based can be made clear in debate. This does not mean, however, that honorable compromises, which do not sacrifice principle, cannot be worked out.

What I have attempted this morning to suggest to you in this brief rundown is that our civics textbooks and our collegiate courses on the legislative process may need to be revised. We tend to forget, in our desire to accomplish legislative goals, that the founding fathers who wrote our Constitution, were themselves practical politicians who wished to vest power in such a way that its exercise would always be subject to checks and balances. They did this to avoid tyranny, and they recognized that they were loading the dice so to speak, in favor of those who oppose action. But this was a deliberate choice based upon the theory that proposed law, which affects all, should be closely examined and carefully considered before it becomes binding upon all. Much room was left for subsequent improvement and adjustment. It is because we have this flexibility in our system that it has survived the test of time and changed social and economic relationships. Under it, if there is a need, a way can be found to meet that need. But to do it, Congress, the people, and the executive administration must work together to achieve the balance which overcomes the difficulties.

The first steps have been taken in educational legislation. They are not the final or only steps we shall take. But we have started at a good pace because the time was ripe and the American people are ready to honor and fulfill the commitment to educational opportunity which is inherent in our democracy.

In conclusion, I should like to make one final point for you as professionals in the field of guidance and counseling with respect to legislation. Of all groups in education, you are perhaps the closest to the problem. Young people are turning to you for advice and service with respect to the most important decision, outside of marriage, that they will be called upon to make--a decision upon a pattern of lifetime activity to be followed. It is a very heavy responsibility. You are aware of the training needs of those who aspire to join your ranks. Recruitment for your profession, given the variety of programs requiring your skills, must be intensified. The caliber of the profession as a whole must be strengthened if justice is to be done to your clients.

What can you contribute as individuals and through your professional organizations to gain the improvements you desire?

May I suggest that in view of the complexity of the legislative task we share that:

First, you review with care present proposals to see where you can widen areas of agreement to resolve differences which may exist based upon the artificial categories of elementary, secondary, community college, four year college and university, including graduate, training. Unless each segment of educators can work together cooperatively with every other segment of educators whether they be public or private in the interests of the education of all our young people, education bills may languish in Congress. Unity of purpose to reach common goals should be your watchword.

Second, make known your needs to your Senators and your Representatives. Write them, talk to them when you come to Washington. Invite them to visit your schools and show them how well you are doing an important job, and what a better job you could do with the encouragement of the passage of specific legislation. But construe your interest broadly to include all legislation which will improve the opportunity of young people to acquire the best education our brains and money can develop.

Finally, maintain your interest, your enthusiasm, and your purpose. Remember the comfort of Matthew 15:28:

"...great is thy faith: be it unto you even as thou wilt..."

WORK-STUDY PAPERS

COUNSELORS
SUPPLY, DEMAND, NEED

by

Arthur A. Hitchcock, Executive Director
American Personnel and Guidance Association

INTRODUCTION

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are:

1. To show the number of professional counselors functioning today in the various employment settings.

2. To give a defensible conclusion on the demand and need for such counselors at the present time.

3. To project demands and needs to five and ten years from now.

4. To postulate how the demands and needs can be met.

Background of the Study

The first question in studying counselors is to find where they are located. The largest number of counselors is employed in educational institutions: elementary schools; secondary schools; supplemental education service centers; four-year colleges and universities; junior colleges; graduate and professional schools; and specialized institutions, particularly in nursing and other medical-related schools, and business and technical institutes.

Counselors function also in a number of settings outside of formal educational institutions: rehabilitation services, under Federal and State support and in other community and private agencies; employment services, including the State Employment services and Youth Opportunity Centers, and private employment agencies; Office of Economic Opportunity programs; veterans services, particularly those within the Veterans Administration; armed services; church and church-related settings; youth and adult counseling centers, both public and private; community child guidance and mental health centers; special services for the disadvantaged; and, private practice.

Counseling, in many of the settings listed above, is supported under several federal acts. Such support accelerates the employment of counselors and tends to define the term "counselor." The acts are:

Public Law 30 of the 73rd Congress - The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 (Establishment of the United States Employment Service)

Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress - Disabled Veterans Rehabilitation Act of 1943 and Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress - The G.I. Bill of 1944 - Regarding the Veterans Administration Counseling Program as amended in later years. (And War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1961.)

Public Law 83-565 - The Vocational Rehabilitation Act (1954 Amendments)

Public Law 85-864 - The National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Amended by Public Law 88-210 and Public Law 88-665)

Public Law 88-415 - The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (as amended). (And, Area Redevelopment Act of 1961)

Public Law 88-210 - The Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Public Law 88-164 - The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Public Law 88-452 - The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

Public Law 89-10 - The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

These are the principal places where counselors are employed; these are the principal federal acts that at this time are supporting programs which employ counselors. These two factors affect the number of counselors today, and how they can be studied.

The second question is: Who are the counselors? Are the counselors in a state-supervised rehabilitation agency similar in amount and intensity of educational background and experience to the counselors in an elementary school? Do they function in similar roles, even though different in detail? Should both be known as counselors? One way to define the term "counselor" is to state the conditions under which a person will be classified as a counselor. These vary in different programs and under different conditions.

The American Board on Counseling Services approves as counseling staff members persons who "...have completed a master's degree in the behavioral and other social sciences with an emphasis in counseling appropriate to the functions performed by the agency...(and who) have had...counseling supervised during preparation for counseling and before beginning counseling practice." (1)

Under Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act, a counselor, generally, is defined in accordance with the respective state certification requirements. There is variation among the states in the certification requirements (2). A person who could be termed a counselor in one state, in some other states could not be so designated. There is, however, a definite tendency toward the requirements of a master's degree in counseling and guidance for certification as a counselor.

The Office of Economic Opportunity defines counselors for Rural Centers in terms of approximately the master's degree and a position which requires, among other things, "...analyses in depth, lengthy counseling sessions and a variety of techniques." The Women's Residence Centers will accept as counselors only persons who meet the state certification requirements for school counselors of the state in which the center is located, but the master's degree is preferred as a minimum even if not required by the state.

The Statement of Policy of the American Personnel and Guidance Association on the professional counselor designates a two-year program of education as the background for counselors (3).

These are samplings of the expectations or requirements of several different groups and organizations for the naming of individuals as counselors. Despite the many differences, the various counseling programs indicated by the settings in which counselors are employed and by the public laws that support counseling show that:

1. Professional counselors working with the handicapped, with the disturbed, or in colleges and universities are likely to acquire that status only with a minimum of two years of graduate study.

2. Professional counselors in other settings, such as schools and programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, are likely to acquire professional

counselor status with one year of graduate study.

This is the condition today. The conclusion relative to the two groups is borne out by a study of the membership of the American Personnel and Guidance Association which shows a larger proportion of doctoral level degree persons in the first category of professional counselors than in the second (4).

Clearly it is impossible to reach a neat conclusion for identifying counselors for the purposes of this study. But it is necessary to reach a workable conclusion.

The criterion for the designation of professional counselor in this paper is the recognition by appropriate, competent authority of the counselor in a program or practice. Thus, for example, persons classified as counselors for support under Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act meet certain minimal criteria; they are called counselors, and they perform work that is called counseling. The assigning of an occupational title by suitable authority is actual practice in the United States. This occurs in medicine, social work, psychology, nursing - whatever field one looks to. There are abuses in any field and in counseling there are persons who are called counselors who have not been adequately trained. The authority by which such persons become classified as counselors is not competent to exercise the recognition of counselors. So far as possible, only competent authorities are used in this study.

The very fact of the competence of the recognizing authority explains in part the difficulty of knowing how many counselors there are today. In some settings, such as counselors in private practice, there is virtually no enforceable, competent authority for the recognition of counselors.

The difficulty of knowing the number of counselors functioning today is enhanced further by the impossibility of obtaining accurate counts. Even the authority that does the best accounting of large-scale employment of counselors, namely, under Title V-A of NDEA, has experienced some difficulties in obtaining accurate reports on NDEA supported counselors. The problem is complicated also by the translation of part-time counselors into Full-Time Equivalent Counselors.

The translation inevitably produces a grey area. However, the intent in this paper is to present as accurate a picture of the number of counselors as possible.

PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS IN THE UNITED STATES

It is estimated that between 50,000 and 60,000 professional counselors are currently employed in the United States. These are full-time and part-time. Only about 50,000 can be determined to be recognized by competent authority. The process of arriving at these figures follows.

Counselors in Educational Institutions

Public Secondary Schools (Including Junior High Schools). In the school year 1964-65, the U. S. Office of Education estimates that there are 40,975 guidance personnel, and this figure translates into 31,000 Full-Time Equivalent Counselors for a ratio of 507 students per Full-Time Equivalent Counselor. The total number of persons is derived from an estimated 3 percent increase over 1963-64. In that year the actual number was 39,660. The Full-Time Equivalent figure is based upon an estimated 5 percent increase from 1963-64 in which year the number of Full-Time Equivalent Counselors was 29,273. The greater percent increase is significant for it shows the continued increase, since the inception of NDEA support, of actual full-time counselors.

Public Elementary Schools. No accurate count of elementary school counselors is available or even possible. It is possible, however, to estimate. Smith and Eckerson (5) have completed a study of the Child Development Consultant (CDC) in the elementary school. The Child Development Consultant may be a social worker, psychologist, or counselor who spent at least one day per week in an elementary school. Only schools with enrollments of more than 100 were included. In 1962-63, one-fourth of such schools had CDC's. This was 1 CDC (about 1 day per week) per 789 students. It is possible that this could mean that in schools in which the CDC is a counselor, the ratio of counselor to students is the same. Wrenn reported in 1962 (6) an estimated ratio of 1 counselor to 690 students in schools that had counselors. If the ratio is approximately 1 to 725 (an estimated point between these two estimates); if, as reported by Smith and Eckerson, 13,000 schools had such assistance; then, in 1962-63 there would have been 8,359 elementary school counselors. Waetjen in an unpublished study estimates that 42.9 percent of the elementary schools have counseling services. It is believed that all of these estimates exaggerate the actual number of elementary school counselors. From information available in Oregon, Baltimore and Baltimore County, New York City, and Wichita (all areas that have bona fide professional counselors, largely on a full-time basis) it is believed that the actual figure could not be higher than 2,500 for the entire nation. This is a hazardous guess, based only upon the idea of the probability of counselors in specific areas of the country. The __1964 Manpower Report of The President__ (p. 180) gives an estimate of 4,000. Recent discussions both in the Office of Education and in the Department of Labor, however, indicate very little basis for this figure. Confusion in terminology and lack of competent authority for recognizing elementary school counselors create a condition that makes a survey at this time fruitless.

__Junior Colleges__. A study being conducted by Dr. Max R. Raines of student personnel programs in junior colleges will give information on the extent of such programs. Unfortunately, it will yield no data on the actual number of professional counselors. Since the study is not published, a verbal report was given on the number of Student Personnel Specialists, a term that includes all persons in student personnel. From a sampling, it is estimated that in the approximately 200 junior colleges that have enrollments over 1,000, there are about 1,500 student personnel specialists, and in the 400 with enrollments under 1,000, there are approximately 874 specialists. Also, in the smaller colleges only 40 percent spend as much as 90 percent of their time in their specialty, but in the larger colleges, 70 percent devote that much time.

The ratio of counselors to students is known to vary from approximately 1 to 100 to 1 to 6,000. Using this known variation as a condition, it is estimated by some that perhaps one-third of the specialists are counselors. This would be 791 counselors, full and part-time. This estimate may be high, but it is the only figure that has any rationale.

Four Year Colleges and Universities. In four year institutions data on the number of counselors are completely lacking. Wrenn has reported to the author that some persons have estimated that there is one professional counselor per 1,000 students. It is believed that this is lower than actuality. But, if this figure is correct, it would mean that there are slightly more than 4,000 professional counseling personnel in these institutions. For lack of anything more reliable, this will be used (7).

Graduate and Professional Schools. Although it is impossible to find the number of counselors functioning in graduate schools, nevertheless, this level of education is significant for this study because it appears likely that student personnel staffs will expand and that counseling personnel in particular will increase greatly. This is likely to occur for three reasons:

1. The increases in student population are spectacularly large at the graduate level. (More than 100,000 in the four years from 1957 to 1961; more than 100,000 in the three years from 1961 to 1964; more than 130,000 (projected) in the three years from 1964 to 1967; more than 120,000 in the two years from 1967 to 1969.) As educational institutions increase in population, they tend to introduce and then utilize more fully counseling personnel. It is known that schools of medicine are now using such persons. It is conjectured that graduate schools of law and business will do this. Graduate divinity schools already employ counselors.

2. The expense of graduate education also will force the use of more counseling personnel. Society and individuals cannot afford the financial waste of unsuccessful talent in highly expensive graduate schools.

3. A final reason is the likelihood of more experimentation with new types of educational programs and new organizational patterns such as those now being tried in medicine. Experiment in educational patterns is likely to introduce counseling as a help in the success of, and in understanding the human

dynamics of such changes.

At present there might be as many as 200 counselors in graduate schools. From the author's knowledge of specific situations, this would be a conservative estimate.

Specialized Institutes. These are post high school schools of nursing, other medical-related fields, business and technical training institutes with programs of one to three years. In 1961-62, there were almost 563,000 such students reported. The actual figure today is surely very much higher. Counselors are provided in such institutions, but no actual count is available. Some, it is known, provide a full-time professional counselor for as few as 300 students. The mean ratio is probably much higher. It is likely as high as 1 to 1,000. With the increases in enrollments that have occurred, there could be as many as 500 counselors employed.

Counselors in Non-Educational Institutions

Rehabilitation. An unpublished report by the Department of Labor places the number of rehabilitation counselors at 3,500. This is an estimate based upon a ratio of 1 counselor to 614 handicapped persons. This figure is reasonably consistent with estimates that can be made from data on the employment of rehabilitation counselors provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and in a study completed under the auspices of the National Rehabilitation Association (8).

Employment Services. The data presented here will include only the state employment services because data are not available on private agencies and there is no competent authority upon which to base any estimate.

According to Department of Labor data there are 3,000 counselors in state employment services. (February 1, 1965 - Updated May 1, 1965.) In a survey accomplished in May, 1964, by the U. S. Employment Service, it was found that 41.7 percent spent less than 50 percent of their time in counseling. More than half of the remaining 58.3 percent devoted over 90 percent of their time to counseling. (Total N = 2,933.) There is no conversion provided to translate the part-time counselors into full-time equivalent counselors. It is known that some who do part-time counseling spend remaining time in counseling-related activities. More serious is the fact that only 37.5 percent of these doing counseling are actually employed in counselor classifications. 62.5 percent are in other job categories. This group, however, includes most of those who spend less than 50 percent of their time in counseling.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates the number of state employment service counselors in FY 1965 to be 3,605. The number includes MDTA counselors and Area Redevelopment Act counselors.

Other. In the Veterans Administration Services there are approximately 750 counselors. In the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, the number of counselors is changing rapidly; currently there would appear to be roughly 400 in the Job Corps and 50 in the Community Action Programs, but the figures are very fluid. Additional counselors in adult centers, in pastoral counseling, in other community settings, in private practice raise the number, probably considerably, but it is impossible to do more than judge that the large number of programs that require counselors must be employing at least an additional 1,000 counselors.

DEMAND FOR COUNSELORS

In the academic year 1964-65, more counselors would have been employed if two conditions had been met: one, qualified counselors were available; two, budgets had been allowed for them. In the experience of some educational and non-educational institutions, qualified counselors could not be found. On the other hand, we are acquainted with situations in which budgets were incapable of utilizing available talent. This dual condition must be recognized in considering the present and future. Although known to exist in public education, this condition undoubtedly prevails in other places in which counselors are employed.

Demand is considered under two assumptions: first, that the type of conditions existing today will continue; second, that society's and individual's full needs will be the basis of demand. The first assumption forms the rationale for the projection that follows.

The largest demand for counselors has been in public secondary schools. With the assistance of Title V-A of NDEA spectacular changes have occurred in the ratio of students to counselors at the secondary school level, dropping from 1 counselor to 960 students in 1958 to 1 to 507 in 1964-65 (9). The U. S. Office of Education has placed its goal as 1 counselor to 300 students at the secondary level. The demands under the first assumption raise doubts that the aim could be achieved by 1974-75. A recent recalculation (unofficial) shows that five years from now, in 1969-70, the ratio would reduce only to 1 to 456. To reach the 1 to 300 ratio by 1975 would require a reduction in the number of students to counselor of 20 each year from 1964-65. This amount of reduction has not occurred consistently. Nevertheless, it is accepted under the further assumption that the increase in funds to support counseling would be within realistic current conditions.

The demand at the elementary school level undoubtedly will accelerate. The U. S. Office of Education uses the ratio of 600 students to 1 counselor at the elementary level as desirable. This figure comes from a statement at the 1960 White House Conference and has been reported widely. We find no rationale for this, but will use it under this first assumption and will return to the question later. Under this ratio, the need for counselors would be 42,350 in 1965-66 and 53,875 in 1969-70. Obviously, if starting from near zero in 1965-66, the stated need by 1969-70 cannot be achieved. In our calculations, this figure is simply cut in half for 1970 as somewhat closer to estimates on the basis of current conditions.

In higher education, projections of demand can be made. On the basis of the data available (although tenuous) it could be projected that higher education would demand, on current basis, 6,674 counselors in 1969-70 and 7,951 in 1973-74.

Three other areas of employment of counselors should be considered under the first assumption. One is Employment Service counselors. Future projections include MDTA counselors, Area Redevelopment counselors, and Youth Opportunity Center counselors. Federal programs create reality demands for Employment Service counselors. The 3,000 counselors in 1964-65 are expected to increase to 6,494 in 1970 and 7,158 in 1975. These figures omit only the YOC counselors who will add several thousand more as will be shown.

The second is the rehabilitation program which employed approximately 3,500 in 1964. By 1975, on a conservative ratio of 614 clients per counselor, the demand would be 5,695 counselors. The reduction of ratio and the expansion of eligible handicapped for these programs would bring the total demand to nearly twice this figure.

Third, the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act probably will expand greatly, but the projections are very difficult because the future of these programs cannot be known accurately. The estimate of 450 counselors employed in 1965 will increase probably to 900 in 1966 and to at least 3,600 by 1970 and 7,200 in 1975. These are estimates of persons well acquainted with these programs, but the programming is not sufficiently firm to rely upon these estimates at this time. Other areas noted in this paper will create further demand ahead.

Table I summarizes the data under the assumption of the type of conditions existing today continuing into the future. The projections are conservative estimates of the demand for counselors, given the current level of funding and programs. In only two instances - the elementary school and the secondary school - can it be considered that a point is reached in 1975 of desirability, and this is the basis of 1 to 600 pupils in elementary school and 1 to 300 in secondary school. This paper considers these figures minimal.

These figures represent an increase in actual number of full-time counselors of 10,368 per year between 1965 and 1970; and 12,462 per year between 1970 and 1975. Attrition rates are applied to make the projections. Attrition rates vary from an estimate by Bedell of 5 percent per year for NDEA trained counselors to 15 percent estimated by McGough for Employment Service counselors (information made available for this paper by Dr. Ralph C. Bedell and Mr. Norman McGough). Rehabilitation counselor attrition is figured at about 9 percent per year. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates attrition among school counselors at 8 percent to possibly 10 percent. The 5 percent attrition rate is used in this paper because it should be assumed that the counselors are well trained and that they are employed under conditions to utilize their talents, two criteria that are likely to keep the attrition rate down.

Meeting the Demand, General

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates 4,300 master's degrees in counseling and guidance in 1965, based on a constant rate projection, and 4,500 based on a trend projection. The total number during the 10 year period would be 67,288 by the former method and 75,688 by the latter. Considering attrition, and with projections in this study formulated on the basis only of a continuation of present conditions, the production of counselors prepared at the minimal level is shockingly weak. The present program of education of counselors clearly must be more than tripled immediately. By 1970 the production of counselors must be expanded again, probably two-fold. In other words, a raising of the production of counselors five-fold by 1970, three-fifths of which occurs now.

In looking at the supply of counselors to meet the conservative needs estimated in this paper, it is necessary to consider the entire picture. Counselors for children and youth in schools and colleges have dominated the scene. Although they will continue to do so, nevertheless the increase in counseling in institutions outside of the traditional educational institutions probably will accelerate rapidly. The rate will be more apparent in another year when the increase in programs under the Economic Opportunity Act will have begun to show trends. It is anticipated that the demand for counselors will be higher than can be predicted now.

This paper thus far has established the point that even a conservative

projection of demand for counselors shows that there must be an immediate and heavy increase in counselor education. Before looking into the means for meeting the demand, it is proposed that a new view be taken of the need and demand for counselors. This is a consideration of the second assumption, namely that society's and individual's full needs will be the basis of demand.

SOCIAL READINESS FOR COUNSELING

Counselors are in demand because society needs the contribution that counseling can make to individual and social development. The need is felt and financial means found to meet the need because conditions of the society create a climate favorable to counseling. The most compelling conditions are explained.

Psychological, Social, Economic Conditions

In his message on legislation to combat poverty (10), President Johnson called for 2,000 counselors in 1964-65 to serve in centers to help disadvantaged youth into training, employment, and careers. The President expressed the need of economically and socially deprived youth for the kind of assistance that counselors can give. He also implied that the society needs counselors to help the government fulfill its obligation to individuals and to strengthen the society. But the President's statement also means that the society is financially able to support counseling.

The society, in 1964, had developed a readiness for action. Triggered by Michael Harrington's analysis and exposé of poverty (11), and other research and writing, the society, with Presidential leadership, was psychologically ready to create opportunities for deprived individuals to move into more abundant lives.

The psychological readiness of the society was nurtured by an uneasiness about the 20 percent of the population that is seriously deprived economically and socially. There is evidence that a significant portion of the population was concerned for and cared about other humans. The birth of the Peace Corps and its successful growth constituted one proof. The most concerned portion of the population is likely to be larger among youth than oldsters. And, the under-

twenty-five age group is becoming the dominant voice of the population (12). The society had a psychological readiness that enabled it to respond to the nation's leadership that called for constructive movement of a large part of the population.

The movement could not occur, however, without financial capability. The society has the capability. As pointed out by Dr. Walter W. Heller (13) the national economy has appreciable prospects of expansion as evidenced by the gap between the actual Gross National Product and the potential GNP. This indicates the ability of the society to support the improvement of its people. The improvement, in turn, feeds the continuing strengthening of the society.

This movement of the society affects counselors. It means that conditions are such that the utilization of counselors that has started not only will continue, but probably will expand. The potential of greater financial support is present, and the demand for counselors is surging forth. For example, the Rural Centers under the Office of Economic Opportunity have a ratio of one professional counselor per 100 enrollees, but persons well acquainted with the demands upon counselors in the Centers state that the ratio should be reduced to 50 enrollees per counselor.

The society long ago established the need for counselors for secondary school students going to college and for others in more affluent or favored communities. It now has established the same condition, emphasized by President Johnson's public call for counselors, for the population that is socially and economically jeopardized.

Population Movement

Counseling started in city schools (Boston, Grand Rapids, Detroit, Seattle, San Francisco). It always has been strongest in urban areas (14). Now, with 73 percent of the nation's population predicted for urban living by 1980, there is a demographic condition that history teaches will mean a heavier demand for counselors than would be the case if the population movement were into non-urban areas. If the history of counseling can serve as a prediction for the future, a constantly expanding part of the population will be urbanized and will demand more adequate counseling, probably more adequate than represented by the 300-students-to-1-counselor ratio stated for the nation at large.

Urban areas are more sophisticated than non-urban regions. The urban citizen demands more. The population movement into megalopolis will be accompanied by more counselors for all age levels and for many different types of city activity - such as employment and guidance centers, mental health centers, and child centers, in addition to the formal educational institutions.

The Complex Society

Harbison and Myers state that "The proportion of national income devoted to human resource development is likely to rise in all countries that are growing." (15) The United States is not only growing, but is a complex, modernized society requiring high-level manpower for its vitality and continuing education that enables individuals to shift from outmoded jobs to new jobs and to make personal lives continually more satisfying. As Harbison and Myers point out, "vocational counseling" is needed for dropouts (16), but counseling also is needed more and more for the entire population as it lives in a progressively more complex society.

A NEW CONCEPT OF DEMAND

Introduction

This nation has made a commitment to education. Education has been placed as the core element in breaking the cycles of poverty by which children and youth can first feel their way from, and then burst out of the cycles. The demands for education will jump. Eight million in higher education by 1973, in contrast to 4.5 million in 1963 is but a part of the change. Institutes beyond the high school will increase greatly, possibly even in much larger proportion than colleges and universities generally. These institutes, like community junior colleges and municipal universities, will become centers not only for students moving directly from secondary school to further preparation, but also for persons moving from outmoded jobs to education and training for new ones, for persons who have been dropouts and need flexible environments for rising to better levels of competence, for persons who need new educational experiences to create fuller lives for a day of many presses.

Counseling demands are related directly to this kind of educational commitment. But, in addition, counseling is related to new kinds of environments outside of formal, though flexible, institutions of education. The Youth Opportunity Centers, the Job Corps Centers for men and for women, the Community Action Programs, the Employment Services are examples today of these new environments. As this is written, it has been learned that two major cities are organizing guidance centers to fill unmet needs. The Educational Services Centers provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 have yet to be started, and they are open to innovation.

Society is saying that the needs of people center in education, conceived broadly. Society also states, through legislative acts, that sound, professional counseling is needed by people to enable them to utilize the opportunities for greater lives that the commitment to education connotes. Society can make the statement about counseling, but it must then be translated into action programs.

This is a concept of needs of individuals in the total population for counseling assistance. To look more globally, and translate the need into proposed action constitutes the purpose of this section of the study.

Demands for Counselors in Terms of Total Population Needs

The Traditional Bases of Counselor Needs. This paper takes issue with several of the bases for need of counselors that normally have been held.

1. That a ratio of 600 students to one counselor in elementary schools has any foundation. This figure, as stated earlier, was brought out in the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. It seemed as though a counselor

should be able to answer the needs of twice as many elementary school students as secondary. Experience does not bear this out. Elementary school counselors spend 50 percent to 60 percent of their time directly with students and most of the remaining time with teachers and parents. How, on these grounds can one substantiate a formula like this? The contention of this paper is that true needs of individuals in today's society are no different in the demand they create at the elementary level than at the secondary level.

2. That the junior college and technical institute fall into a higher education category in which students suddenly, after grade 12, have relatively little need for counseling. (That is, that their needs are met in a ratio of 1,000 or more students per counselor.) In the junior college - and comparable level one, two, and three-year institutes - basic needs of individuals for competent counselors are extremely great. These students are seeking directions, making decisions, developing expanded ideas of life. Adequate help can make the difference between unmanageable presses and misdirections on the one hand and developmental experiences of life-forming value on the other. From reports from those who work in junior colleges and similar level institutes, this paper contends that such students, to be parts of a good and great society, need as thorough counseling help as at any earlier level.

3. That few students in four-year colleges and universities and in graduate schools need competent counseling services. On the basis of suppositions, professional counselors have functioned in bureaus that are apart from the ongoing life of the institutions, separated from the system of faculty advising. In one situation, however, professional counselors were related directly to the faculty that served as advisors to freshmen and sophomores. They functioned in a team way. These counselors served far fewer than 1,000 students each, and they worked in direct relation to the advisors. Each performed his particular work. The measurable results were a marked decrease in the drop-out rate. In another instance, at the graduate level in a school of law, students who appeared, in the first year, to be likely failures were referred to counselors. It happened

almost immediately that the counselors found themselves conferring with faculty members in a mutual exchange about these students. Without extending the evidences - and they could be - we find no grounds for the assumption that undergraduates and graduates are not in need of counseling, except in minor numbers of instances. The evidences, from many instances, are on the opposite side.

4. That in all of education there is a fixed ratio of counselors to students. It is known that in Higher Horizon and similar programs in schools for the disadvantaged, the counselors have been responsible for 50 or fewer students. And, teacher loads have similarly been reduced. The programs under the Economic Opportunity Act substantiate the point. To cite one example, the ratio of enrollees to counselor in Rural Centers is 100. Even in suburban, college-oriented high schools, instances have been reported that dispel the myth of the fixed ratio. For instance, a very capable counselor stated that this year he has 147 senior high school counselees and he finds that at last he can really work with them and can communicate directly with teachers. The experiences of counselors who have worked with drop-outs are similar.

5. That Employment Services (and similar programs such as Youth Opportunity Centers) are for job interviews and quick, although short, placements. All of these programs require a new view of counseling. The work requires counseling that will enable youth and adults to develop their concepts of themselves, to find themselves, to evolve plans and directions of longer-term duration than a brief placement. The actions of counselors in these agencies constitute interventions in lives of people. This cannot be treated lightly. The society needs counseling assistance outside of educational institutions that provide as thoroughly sound help as any in the formal educational institutions. Such counseling permits a counselor to work with considerably fewer persons than when he sees each one briefly.

A Proposal for a Different Determination of Counselor Need. The foregoing analysis of the traditional bases of determining need for counselors that this paper expresses the belief that the bases that have been used are not the best means for determining need. We are discussing the need for professionally competent counselors in a society that believes that such counselors are needed both in and outside of traditional educational institutions. The following proposal is presented for determining the need for counselors.

The number of counselors at all levels of education should be based upon the number of teaching faculty. The reasons for this are:

1. Fundamentally, the best educational experiences obtain when teachers and counselors function together. This point has been established. But, in the future it will be enhanced, for students at the college level as well as at other levels are being forced, by society, to be considered as individuals to whom the teaching faculty as well as counseling faculty must relate. Experience in elementary and secondary schools as well as some experiences in higher education bear out the validity of this condition.

2. The ever-changing nature of curricula experiences (broadly conceived) forces a close working-together of teachers and counselors. Appropriate responses of schools, colleges, and institutes to changing needs of students can be given best only when counselors, interpreting student needs, can work with teachers, constructing educational experiences.

3. The non-graded elementary school, already tried in secondary schools, will spread to colleges and other institutes. In fact, it has. Advanced placement in college is an example. Necessary for sound educational experiences for the gifted and for the disadvantaged, the non-graded concept will expand. It probably will be the key, with counseling, to the transition from high school to college. Individualized programs of educational experiences necessitate not only counselors, but also counselors who are related directly to teachers. The non-graded, individualized, educational experiences reenforces the concept of counseling as a part, with teaching, of the total educational experience.

4. The variation in educational needs under differing conditions emphasizes the necessity of viewing counseling (and therefore counselors) as responsive to the differing demands for teachers. For example, the disadvantaged have more

teachers per students than others in other schools. Support for such schools emphasize this difference. Counselors can be effective when similarly related to the needs of student populations. In a secondary school in which the teachers have totals of, say, fifty students, counselors must be similarly reduced in load or otherwise they will drag the educational thrust that the teacher is able to exert. This concept of counselor related to teacher forces flexibility. Support for schools for the disadvantaged will buttress this concept. This is an example of the commitment to education.

5. Finally, there is a significant psychological concept. With the idea that counselors work together with teachers, it is good psychology to state this by open deed.

The number of counselors in non-formal educational institutions should be based upon the population to be served. Three populations will be delineated. The response of counseling to the needs of society - and of individuals therein - has been handicapped by the idea that what worked ten years ago - or even three - is viable today. The extension of trends from the past should be abandoned. A fresh look must be taken at the needs of a society that has elevated itself to a concern for all the people.

1. The first population is the work force. This includes persons moving into the work force for the first time, persons reentering the work force after absences such as women after raising families, and those permanently in the work force, but who are required by work conditions to seek new jobs.

Mr. Norman McGough has supplied for this paper a way to look at the work force in terms of counseling needs. He suggests three groups: those under 22 years of age; 22 - 44; and those 45 and over. His supposition is that of those under 22, approximately 50 percent would require counseling; in the next age group, about 10 percent; those 45 and over, about 25 percent.

2. The second population is the disaffiliated. These are the drop-outs from school and those youth who are so far from productiveness that they are non-affiliated with the labor force. It is believed that they should be considered

in a separate group. Their counseling needs will be met partially in Youth Opportunity Centers and partially in other centers to which they go, such as Job Corps Centers. The society is committed to help these youth to improve, but is is unrealistic to view them, in toto, as part of the labor force.

3. The third population comprises the handicapped. Their needs for counseling also are unique. It is believed that they, too, should be considered outside of the regular labor force. The concept of the handicapped surely will broaden in the years ahead.

It must be clear that within the entire three populations, some will be in training at various times. But, it is believed that determinations can be made for the counseling needs of each of the three populations that will cover such actual places as, for example, Employment Service Offices and Women's Residence Centers. At any one time, the society would determine the places in which various proportions of the counselors would function, but for overall planning this would not affect the training needs.

Conclusion

There are some respects in which these proposal may be considered inadequate. For example, what about pastoral counseling, marriage counseling, and private practice? While these are important, it is believed that for planning it is essential to look at the areas in which the combined demand constitutes probably as much as 95 percent of the complete demand for counselors. The educational institutions include all such institutions. The non-formal educational needs are total for these needs.

This view is a societal - individual view, not institutional, even though it is recognized that counselors eventually work in various kinds of institutions. The attempt is made to look at counseling in terms of the counseling function in society.

Now this concept will be translated into needs for counselors.

SOCIETY'S NEEDS FOR COUNSELORS

Formal Educational Institutions

Following the concept put forth, it is proposed that in elementary schools, there should be one full-time counselor in team with not more than seven full-time teachers. This would be about 193 students in public elementary schools in 1965 and about 259 in non-public schools. It has been established that seven is about as many persons as one can relate to soundly in the kind of relationship existing between counselors and teachers. The essential point is that seven teachers in relation to one counselor is really the maximum that could be expected for really effective work. There should be experimentation to find the most workable number. It probably would vary under differing conditions.

In 1965, the figures for the elementary school would appear in this way:

Elementary School	No. of Teachers	Students per Teacher	No. of Counselors (1 per 7 teachers)
Public	958,000	27.6	136,845
Non-public	149,000	37.0	21,300
TOTAL	1,107,000		158,145

Recognizing many variations, we see no reason for assuming a different ratio in the secondary school. On a national level, it is difficult to be certain of the actual number of students who would be involved. An NEA study reports secondary school pupils per teacher as 30.6 in cities with 12,000 or more elementary and secondary students. The U. S. Office of Education reports 21.8 for all public secondary schools. Again, it is urged that consideration be given to the concept of teacher-counselor relationship in developmental educational experiences. According to Office of Education data, the facts in 1965 would work out in this way:

Secondary School	No. of Teachers	Students per Teacher	No. of Counselors (1 per 7 teachers)
Public	698,000	21.8	99,713
Non-public	77,000	19.5	11,000
TOTAL	775,000		110,713

In junior colleges, institutes, four-year colleges and universities, graduate schools - in all of education beyond the high school - we see no reason for changing the concept of one full-time counselor to seven full-time teachers. It is very difficult to arrive at a precise figure. Data from the Office of Education would indicate that approximately 50,000 counselors were needed in degree-granting institutions in 1965. If there are 4,000 counselors in colleges and universities, the indicated need is more than ten times that figure.

In all educational institutions, there will be additional persons in the student personnel area. In the elementary school, psychologists and social workers should, in turn, be determined as a function of counselors. A possible ratio, that should be experimented with, would be one psychologist and one social worker for every three to seven counselors.

This paper, at this stage, is seeking to avoid the numbers game, and rather to concentrate upon the application of a concept. Obviously, the numbers are large. But the needs in today's society are large. It is believed that the application of this concept could create tremendous benefits to individuals and society.

In reaching the desired level of counselor involvement, several steps will have to be taken. These will be related at the conclusion of this section.

Non-Formal Educational Institutions

Work Force. McGough, in an informal paper, proposes that, in keeping with the concept of need proposed in this paper, there be a new look at the counseling needs in relation to the work force. It would be assumed that 50 percent of those under 22 (entering the work force) would require counseling, 10 percent of those 22 - 44, and 25 percent of those 45 and over. It is assumed, also, and is strongly contended in this paper, that 1.7 interviews per client is inadequate. It should be at least 3. Using these figures, the needs in 1964 were for 6,804 full-time counselors. In 1970, the need would be 7,742; in 1975, 8,292.

It is believed that this is a more realistic way of viewing the need for counselors in the Employment Services, the Youth Opportunity Centers, the MDTA programs, and the Area Redevelopment programs.

Disaffiliated. The e are the ones who are referred to by Dr. Donald N. Michael as the "unaffiliated" since they have never connected with the work force. They are largely dropouts from school. They are the ones who are now the subject of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. For those who can be reached, the number who can be effectively helped by one counselor at any given time is probably not more than 50. We find it difficult to translate this into a total demand. But if 100,000 such youth were to be helped this year, there would be a need for 2,000 counselors.

Rehabilitation Services. Applying the same concept of need, undoubtedly, the ratio of handicapped clients to the rehabilitation counselors would be reduced. The handicapped population is estimated to be 3,000,000 in 1964 and to reach 3,628,000 in 1975. Instances have been reported in which the demands of the handicapped for counseling assistance could not be met. But it is impractical to project an actual figure. It is known that many more counselors are needed for the handicapped.

Supply of Counselors

It already has been pointed out that a three-fold increase is needed in counselor education to produce counselors even for a conservative estimate of need. The concept proposed in this paper calls for much more. It is believed that the problem can be approached with several lines of solution.

Professional Counselors. These form the core of counseling. These are the people referred to in this proposal. They must be highly competent. On the way to meeting the needs shown in this proposal, the level of competence of the counselors must be maintained, even higher than generally today. Therefore, there should be:

1. A program of tripling the production of counselors trained at two years of graduate work beginning now. By 1970, this program should be expanded

again by approximately doubling it.

2. Those persons serving as counselors and who are inadequately prepared should have further preparation now through summer institutes and semester and year-long programs. By this means, a marked increase can occur among those who potentially are very able but who simply need more education. These persons will be found in the schools and the employment services.

3. A program of continual improvement of professional counselors through summer institutes or institutes even at other times during the year.

Subprofessional Assistants. There is a great resevoir of persons who would like to enter counseling related work. Many of them have ample potentialities. The experience in the CAUSE Program of 1964 proved this. Further evidences have been found in cities such as the District of Columbia where counselor aides were recruited to work in the schools.

Accompanying the increase in professional counselors, there should be large-scale training of counselor assistants. These persons can perform valuable work under a professional counselor. As the nation goes through the years of shortages of professional counselors, it should be expected that two or three subprofessional aides could work effectively under one counselor.

Many such subprofessionals can continue their counselor preparation part-time, and later go into full-time preparation. This group will furnish an excellent source for the production of well-qualified counselors.

Untapped Resources. Experiences of persons involved in the preparation of this paper, reports from Dr. John Walker of the Department of Labor, evidence from applications for the 1964 CAUSE Program, experiences of persons in programs for women returning to education - all point to the probability that there are many fully or partially trained counselors who are not working and who would like to return to counseling. Probably many of them will need further preparation. They could perform as subprofessionals while taking additional preparation.

Conclusion. The key to the future is the preparation of counselors. It is believed that there are many innovations that could be entered into such preparation. There could be combinations of practical work and university preparation. Large scale closed circuit TV could be used for in-service training. Universities could assume responsibility for a number of satellites where work is in progress, and additional preparation is going on at the same time. The possibilities of effective innovation are limitless.

In the boldness with which the genuine needs of people and their world are met will be the success or failure of the concept upon which society places such faith - the counselor in a democratic society.

TABLE I

DEMAND FOR COUNSELORS UNDER CONTINUATION OF CURRENT CONDITIONS AND ON CURRENT BASES[1]

	1965	1970	1975
Elementary Schools[2]	2,500 (est.)	26,987	53,500
Secondary Schools[2]	31,000	44,938	71,887
Junior Colleges	791	4,000	5,000[3]
Colleges and Universities	4,000	6,674	7,591[3]
Employment Service	3,000	7,494	8,158
Rehabilitation	3,500	5,187	5,695
OEO Programs	450	3,600	7,200
TOTALS	45,241	98,880	159,391

[1] Counselors for other programs and practices would add at least 5,000 in 1965; probably 7,500 in 1970; and 10,000 in 1975.

[2] These data are only for public schools.

[3] Data are for 1973-74.

TABLE II

ANNUAL DEMAND FOR NEW COUNSELORS, BASED ON 5 PERCENT ATTRITION RATE

	For Demands in Table I	For Non-Public School Demands[2]	For Programs Not listed[3]	Total
1965	12,630	1,040	500	14,170
1966	13,142	1,040	500	14,682
1967	13,666	1,040	500	15,206
1968	14,185	1,040	500	15,725
1969	14,703	1,040	500	16,243
1970	15,221	1,040	500	16,761
1971	17,939	1,040	500	19,479
1972	18,562	1,040	500	20,102
1973	19,185	1,040	500	20,725
1974	19,807	1,040	500	21,347
1975	20,431	1,040	500	21,971

[1] In 1965, a total of 14,170 counselors need to be trained to meet the demands of 1966.

[2] Data on counselors are not available. It is estimated that the non-public elementary schools could be expected to have one counselor per 1,000 students by 1975. It is doubtful that there are scarcely any at this time. Therefore, the 5,900 counselors needed for 5,900,000 students by 1975 are allocated to be added each of the ten years. The secondary schools already have some counselors, estimated to be about one to 1,000. We therefore start with 1,500 counselors in 1965 and add sufficient each year to reach a ratio of 1 to 300 in 1975, with 1,800,000 students. Attrition in non-public schools is much less than in public schools.

[3] These are outside of regular counseling programs. The increase can only be estimated.

REFERENCES

1. American Board on Counseling Services, Criteria for Approval of Certain Counseling Services. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

2. Camp, Dolph, Guidance Workers Certification Requirements. Bulletin 1960, No. 14 (Rev.), (1963) OE-25005A. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

3. Loughary, John W., Editor, Counseling, A Growing Profession. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965, p. 77.

4. American Personnel and Guidance Association. 1962 Survey of the American Personnel and Guidance Association Membership. Unpublished Mimeo. Washington, D. C.: 1965.

5. Smith, Hyrum and Louise Eckerson, Unpublished Study of Child Development Specialist. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1965.

6. Wrenn, C. Gilbert, The Counselor in a Changing World. Washington, D. C.: The American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962, p. 114.

7. U. S. Office of Education, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1973-74. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1964, p. 6.

8. National Rehabilitation Association, Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study, Final Report. (Stanley J. Smits, Project Director.) Washington, D. C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964, pp. 4, 5.

9. U. S. Office of Education, Commitment to Youth, OE-25039. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1964. Additional data furnished by the U. S. Office of Education and by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

10. President Lyndon B. Johnson's Message on Poverty, March 16, 1964.

11. Harrington, Michael, The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.

12. Drucker, Peter F., "American Directions," Harper's Magazine. Vol. 230, No. 1377, February 1965, pp. 39-45.

13. Heller, Walter W., Economic Man. Unpublished address at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 13, 1965.

14. U. S. Office of Education, Commitment to Youth. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1964, (especially p. 23).

15. Harbison, Frederick and Myers, Charles A., Education Manpower and Economic Growth. New York: McGraw - Hill Book Company, 1964, p. 187.

16. Harbison and Myers. op. cit., p. 170.

TRAINING INSTITUTIONS: STANDARDS AND RESOURCES

by

Robert O. Stripling, Professor
University of Florida

PURPOSE OF PAPER

The Task Group for the Invitational Conference requested that this paper report, "a study of institutional standards and resources, including agency resources for counselor preparation--How many programs are now preparing counselors?--What are their qualifications, resources, standards for staff, facilities, etc.?--How many more personnel could these agencies prepare with additional support?--with particular emphasis being given to changing concepts of academic preparation and interdisciplinary approaches to professional preparation of counselors."

SOURCES OF DATA AND SCOPE OF PAPER

Information was gathered from statistical data and basic source materials as well as from interviews with personnel in a number of government agencies, professional organizations, and institutions of higher learning concerned with the preparation of counselors. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the dedicated individuals who have given so generously of their time and talents.

At the request of the Executive Committee of the Task Group, a broad interpretation has been given to the term "counselor." Specifically, it was requested that certain professional groups not identified as counselors but who work in equally important ways in helping relationships be included, for example, social workers.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS

There is evidence of widespread acceptance among staff members in institutions of higher learning of the standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors. However, the inability to secure the financial support needed for qualified doctoral level staff and for other resources to meet these standards has caused much concern among professional personnel who are knowledgeable of both the lack of institutional resources and the needs in our society for qualified counselors. The seriousness of this situation can be illustrated by the fact that even though 261 institutions in the United States purport to prepare secondary school counselors, consultants to the U. S. Office of Education each year, since 1960, have rated only 35 of these institutions as having strong enough staff and other resources to conduct academic-year Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes for the preparation of secondary school counselors under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. There are between five to ten additional institutions in the United States which have not applied to the U. S. Office of Education for Institute programs who could meet the minimum acceptable standards of program content, staff, and other resources needed to prepare secondary school counselors. Therefore, at the most, there are currently only 45 institutions in the United States that have the capability of meeting minimum standards accepted by the profession for the preparation of secondary school counselors. Forty-four of these institutions offer doctoral programs to prepare secondary school counselors as well as counselors for other settings.

These 45 institutions are now awarding only a little over one-third of the 4,500 master's degrees being given each year to majors in secondary school counseling. This means that approximately two-thirds of the secondary school counselors are receiving the first half of the minimum two-year program in counselor education in institutions that do not meet minimum standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors. Furthermore, less than ten percent of the graduates from these institutions are, each year, completing the minimum two-year graduate program for secondary school counselors. To state it another way, approximately ninety percent of the graduates preparing to be secondary school counselors are completing only the first year of the minimum two years of graduate work needed for the professional counselor working in any setting. It is evident that the increasing awareness of the need for the second year of graduate work and the inability to finance such preparation is causing much frustration among secondary school counselors.

This lack of financial support is a primary reason why some eighty percent of those preparing to be secondary school counselors are getting their preparation through part-time study (night and summer courses). This is being done even though it is widely recognized that the professional counselor for any setting can be prepared only through full-time study extending over two academic years. Part-time study invariably leads to the preparation of "technique-oriented" counselors who, through their didactic instruction, have become students of counseling but who have not, through supervised experiences extending over a period of several months, developed the understandings and skills necessary to function in helping relationships as professional counselors.

The relatively low productivity on the part of the 45 institutions best qualified in terms of program content, staff, and other resources can be attributed largely to the following:

(1) Shortage of Staff: Even though minimum standards indicate that there should be one full-time equivalent (FTE) staff member for each eight FTE students in counselor education, there was, during 1963-64, one FTE staff member to fifteen FTE students. Such a shortage of staff makes it impossible to provide the supervised experiences needed in laboratory work, practicum in individual and small group counseling, and in internship necessary to prepare professionally qualified secondary school counselors.

(2) Lack of Physical Facilities: Minimum acceptable standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors require such facilities as research and testing laboratories; library and other source materials; occupational and educational information workrooms; sound-equipped, one-way vision rooms for individual and small group counseling practice; tape recording equipment; closed-circuit television,

including video tape equipment; private offices of staff members where they can work in confidential relationships with students; etc.

(3) Lack of Both On-campus and Off-campus Facilities for Supervised Experiences: An integral part of the preparation of the secondary school counselor in the minimum two-year program is carefully planned and closely supervised experiences both on and off the campus. As indicated in number one above, there is already a serious shortage of counselor education staff members in even the 45 strongest programs in our colleges and universities. Also, there is a serious shortage among these institutions of the kind of facilities mentioned in two above, which are necessary for quality supervised laboratory and practicum experiences on campus. Moreover, relatively few of these 45 institutions have adequate off-campus cooperating secondary school centers where the prospective counselor can get supervised internship experiences. Such cooperating schools not only need professionally qualified staff members with time allocated for such supervision, but there is also a need for physical facilities in these schools where prospective secondary school counselors can work.

(4) Lack of Commitment on the Part of Institutions of Higher Learning to Financially Support Programs for Secondary School Counselor Preparation: This is true because counselor education is relatively expensive and because of the limited resources among our colleges and universities to meet ever-increasing demands for quality education. It is significant to note that only 10 of the strongest 45 institutions mentioned above are private institutions. Further evidence of this lack of financial commitment by private institutions is indicated by the fact that the U. S. Office of Education, since 1960, has been able to contract with only seven different private institutions to offer academic-year Counseling and Guidance Institutes for the preparation of secondary school counselors.

It is estimated that the 45 institutions mentioned above could double their output of secondary school counselors if given financial support. Furthermore, it is possible that an additional 35 colleges and universities throughout the country could, within three to five years, upgrade their programs to meet at least the minimum standards of the two-year program of professional preparation for secondary school counselors; and that within five to ten years, these institutions could reach the same rate of productivity as the 45 institutions now having the strongest programs will have reached. The extent to which these institutions can develop programs within the next ten years will depend to a great extent upon the number of doctoral level staff members available to teach in these programs as well as upon the financial resources available to support the development of programs.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Virtually little has been done by colleges and universities to develop programs for the professional preparation of elementary school counselors. Although approximately 45 institutions have indicated that they prepare elementary school counselors at the master's degree level; eight at the second year level of graduate work (which is considered the minimum level of preparation for the professional elementary school counselor), and three at the doctoral level, there has been no widely accepted criteria by which to judge the adequacy of these programs.

The recent extension of the National Defense Education Act to include opportunities for the preparation of elementary school counselors as well as support for the development of elementary school counseling programs at the local school level has stimulated an interest on the part of:

(1) School officials to employ elementary school counselors.

(2) College staff members to more carefully examine their counselor education programs for the preparation of elementary school counselors.

M

(3) Professional groups, particularly the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the American School Counselor Association, and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, to initiate programs of action to develop guidelines for the role and preparation of the elementary school counselor as well as standards for evaluating counselor education programs in this area.

The 45 strongest institutions mentioned above are prepared most adequately from the standpoint of staff and other resources to educate elementary school counselors. However, many of these institutions do not claim to have quality programs in this area. Also, it is estimated that from eight to twelve of the institutions included in the thirty-five mentioned above who could upgrade their counselor education programs within three to five years have a nucleus of staff and facilities which could be utilized to develop strong programs for the professional preparation of elementary school counselors. Therefore, it is estimated that within the next five to ten years some thirty to fifty institutions of higher learning throughout the United States could develop strong minimum two-year graduate programs of preparation for elementary school counselors if funds for the development of such programs were made available. At least one-third of these institutions could develop strong doctoral level programs in this area.

STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE COUNSELORS

Counselor educators in institutions of higher learning throughout the United States recognize that the United States Employment Service faces an almost impossible task in its effort to provide professional counseling for those needing such assistance. It is estimated that fifty percent of the youth and twenty-five percent of the older workers who register with the United States Employment Service need professional counseling. The problem faced by the Employment Service is threefold. First, there is need to more clearly define the responsibility of the professional counselor in the local Employment Service office and to allocate more time for counseling with each individual who seeks his help. Second, there is serious need to upgrade present personnel who have the capability, both personally and academically, of becoming qualified counselors. Third, there is a need to attract to the Employment Service counseling program a larger number of well-qualified counselors.

Since 1959, 38 institutions of higher learning throughout the United States have cooperated with the United States Employment Service in providing short-term workshops and summer courses for the professional preparation of Employment Service counselors. Also, a number of these institutions, such as Utah State University, The University of Iowa, The University of Missouri, and The University of Florida, have worked with officials in the United States Employment Service in defining a master's degree program for the professional preparation of counselors. Problems of common concern to counselor educators and to professional staff in the United States Employment Service at both the national and the state level are:

(1) Most of the programs developed to date for the preparation of Employment Service counselors have been master's degree programs which involve only the first year of the two-year program of graduate preparation which is recognized as minimum for a counselor in any setting.

(2) It is widely recognized that counselors cannot be professionally prepared through workshops and summer courses. Such preparation invariably leads to the development of the technique-oriented counselor mentioned above. Professional counselors can be prepared only through full-time, year-long study where there is a balance between didactic instruction and supervised practice experiences. Funds have not been available to either institutions or to prospective Employment Service counselors to make such preparation possible.

(3) There is need for a commitment on the part of State Employment Service personnel to provide supervised counseling and internship experiences for prospective Employment Service counselors. Most

Employment Service offices have not been staffed sufficiently, nor have they had the physical facilities to provide such experiences.

Professional personnel in the United States Employment Service and counselor educators need to agree on guidelines for the supervision of internship experiences for prospective Employment Service counselors. Such guidelines should include, among other things, (1) description of the kind of supervised experiences needed, (2) responsibility of the institution of higher learning, (3) responsibility of the Employment Service, (4) minimum qualifications for staff members in the Employment Service office who supervise counseling candidates, (5) amount of time needed by the Employment Service staff member for the supervision of each counseling candidate, (6) physical facilities needed in the Employment Service office, and (7) amount paid each counseling intern by the United States Employment Service.

(4) As indicated above, it is widely accepted among professional groups throughout the United States that the minimum program of preparation for a counselor in any setting is two academic years of graduate work. Therefore, the two-year minimum program of graduate education for those who wish to enter Employment Service counseling should be clearly defined.

There is considerable overlapping between the 38 institutions which have cooperated with the United States Employment Service in providing short-term workshops and summer programs and the 45 strongest institutions presently preparing secondary school counselors. Most of the 38 institutions not included in this group are among the 35 institutions that have been identified as being able to develop programs for the preparation of counselors within three to five years. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that there are some 60 institutions in the United States that could develop programs of professional preparation for

Employment Service counselors. This is particularly true since there is a close similarity between the content of the program for the preparation of secondary school counselors and that for the preparation for the Employment Service counselors.

Programs of professional preparation for Employment Service counselors could be provided if the Congress would supply funds (through separate legislation similar to N.D.E.A., or through an extension of N.D.E.A.) for the (1) upgrading of present United States Employment Service counselors, and (2) for the professional preparation of those who wish to enter counseling positions with the United States Employment Service. If the present National Defense Education Act should be extended to include Employment Service counselors, the Congress should increase greatly the appropriations for the preparation of counselors as provided in this Act.

It is also recognized by both counselor educators and professional personnel in the United States Employment Service that salaries are too low in most areas of the country to attract professionally qualified Employment Service counselors. If the United States Employment Service is to meet the counseling needs of those whom they are expected to assist, salaries for counselors must be increased.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF COUNSELORS FOR NEW PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN RECENT LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE CONGRESS

In an effort to meet crucial personal, social, and economic needs of our society, the Congress has, in the last several months, passed a number of bills which provide for professionally qualified counselors to work in various settings, for example, youth opportunity centers, youth camps, job training programs, and other community action programs. Because of the serious problems faced by youth and adults in these special programs, counselors must be exceptionally well prepared.

The needs of our society, as highlighted through the enactment of these special programs, have caused counselor educators in institutions throughout the country to look critically at programs of professional preparation. This has resulted in the conclusion that there must be more emphasis on assisting the prospective counselor who will work in _any setting_ to better understand the mores of the various subcultures of our society and to have deeper insights concerning the feelings, attitudes, and levels of aspiration of children, youth, their parents, and other adults from these subcultures. Also, there is a need for counselors to better understand the problems of learning faced by those with varying intellectual and academic abilities from the different segments of society. Counselors working in any setting also need to gain more information about vocational and technical education. Perhaps, more importantly, they need to develop a more positive attitude toward these areas and thereby be in a better position to assist youth. It is essential that weakness in this area of counselor preparation in institutions throughout the U. S. be corrected.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF COUNSELORS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES

There is not specific agreement among staff members in colleges and universities throughout the country concerning standards for the preparation of college counselors and other student personnel specialists. The recent extension of the National Defense Education Act, providing for the preparation of junior college, college, and university counselors, has resulted in increased efforts on the part of various professional groups to reach agreement concerning the role and preparation of college counselors and other student personnel specialists. Such organizations as the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the American College Personnel Association, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education have joint committees working on guidelines that might be used in (1) determining the role of the college counselor and other student personnel specialists, and (2) providing guidelines that can be used by institutions of higher learning in developing and evaluating programs of professional preparation for these personnel.

Most of the 45 institutions mentioned above as having the strongest programs for the preparation of secondary school counselors also have programs, including doctoral level preparation, for the education of college counselors and other student personnel specialists. In addition, the American Psychological Association has approved some 25 doctoral programs in counseling psychology in institutions of higher learning throughout the country. A number of these programs, during the past few years, have contributed significantly to the preparation of doctoral level personnel for counseling and other student personnel positions in higher education. There is considerable overlapping between the institutions approved by the American Psychological Association and the 45 institutions mentioned above. Generally speaking, however, the APA approved programs in counseling psychology are designed to prepare the doctoral level counseling psychologists who will work in college or university counseling centers and are not concerned with the preparation of the more general college or university student personnel specialist who may or may not utilize the counseling relationship in his work.

The basic core of didactic content for the preparation of the junior college or college counselor and other student personnel specialists is very similar to that for the preparation of the school counselor. Beyond this core, there is an emphasis on understanding college youth and the college community in which college youth live and study, as well as the goals, purposes, curricula, and organization of higher education in American society. Also, supervised practicum experiences in counseling and internship experiences in the broader aspects of student personnel work involve working with students in a junior college or college setting.

One of the serious problems faced in preparing junior college and college or university counselors and other student personnel workers is that relatively few of the institutions of higher learning in the U. S. have strong offerings in junior college education or in higher education. Such supportive work is essential in the preparation of junior college or senior college counselors and other student personnel workers.

In most of the APA approved institutions and in most of the 45 institutions mentioned above, working relationships have developed between counselor education staff members and staff members in the college counseling center which provide quality experiences for supervised practicum in counseling. However, in our senior colleges and universities there is need for greater cooperation between the counselor education staff members and staff members in full-time student personnel services to provide quality internship experiences in the broader aspects of college or university student personnel work. Specifically, there is a need for a greater commitment on the part of institutions of higher learning to the importance of providing qualified staff members in student personnel services who are given time in their work load to supervise interns.

Also, counselor education staff members must develop closer working relationships with nearby junior colleges in planning practicum in counseling and internship experiences in junior college student personnel work. If quality preparation is to be achieved, there must be a stronger commitment by the junior college in allocating time of qualified staff, space, and other resources needed in the junior college setting.

Available data indicate that there are only ten colleges and universities in the United States that have the qualified staff in counselor education, the qualified staff and curriculum offerings in the broad aspects of junior college education, and other resources, including cooperative relationships with nearby junior colleges, to offer quality preparation for counselors and other student personnel specialists for the junior colleges. These ten institutions could triple their output of graduates if funds for additional staff and program expansion were made available. Also, there are some ten additional institutions that have the resources to develop programs of professional preparation for counselors and other student specialists at the junior college level if funds were made available for program development and for the preparation of staff to teach in these programs.

Those preparing for counseling and other student personnel services in this area need a breadth of preparation, both in didactic instruction and supervised practice, that will enable them to work effectively with people of different ages and from different subcultures of our society with varying intellectual abilities who are included in the student body of most of our junior colleges that have programs of academic preparation as well as vocational and technical education.

Staff-student ratio (one to eight), physical facilities, and other resources mentioned above as necessary in the preparation of the secondary school counselor are needed for the preparation of junior or senior college counselors and other student personnel specialists. Also, there is a need to identify more clearly the minimum two-year program of professional preparation in these areas, as well as to develop guidelines for the preparation of doctoral level personnel that can be used by institutions of higher learning throughout the country in evaluating their programs.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF COUNSELORS TO WORK IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AGENCIES

There seems to be general acceptance of the guidelines developed for the preparation of counseling psychologists who will work in Veterans' Administration agencies or who will, under contract, counsel with veterans and eligible dependents of veterans. However, there is need to examine these programs of preparation continually in an effort to be assured that the counseling needs of veterans and their dependents can be met. For example, there is an increasing age range among those eligible to such counseling. Not only are veterans as a group getting older, but more eligible dependents of veterans, who represent a younger age group in our society, are reaching the age when they need counseling to assist them in making realistic vocational and educational choices. Among other things, there needs to be an emphasis in these programs of preparation on providing supervised experiences with different age groups from the various subcultures of our society. Also, work in theory of vocational choice and occupational and educational information, as well as in vocational and technical education, is needed by these counselors.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF REHABILITATION COUNSELORS

At present, 38 colleges and universities throughout the United States are offering professional preparation in rehabilitation counseling. There seems to be general agreement that the minimum program of preparation for the rehabilitation counselor is two academic years of graduate work, with emphasis on both theory and supervised practice experiences. Also, there is widespread acceptance of a basic core of preparation consisting of personality theory, counseling theory and practice, statistics and measurement, and vocational development theory and appraisal. Specialized courses for the rehabilitation counselor center around such areas as orientation to rehabilitation counseling, medical information, psychological and sociological components of disability, and specialized placement techniques.

Also, there is general acceptance of the standards developed for supervised field experiences. There has been some difficulty, however, in the implementation of these standards. One of the most difficult problems is that of the commitment of time to the supervision of interns by qualified staff members in field offices.

There seems to be less agreement concerning the content of the program in rehabilitation counseling (beyond the two-year minimum program) for those pursuing the doctor's degree.

It is estimated that six of the thirty-eight institutions now preparing rehabilitation counselors could double their output of students if funds were made available. Approximately ten others could increase their number of students being graduated by fifty percent. Over the next three to ten year period, it is possible that thirty-five additional institutions of higher learning could establish at least the minimum two-year program in rehabilitation counseling if funds could be made available and qualified staff members can be prepared to teach in these programs.

Because of the expanding nature of rehabilitation counseling services, and the increasing needs of our society, rehabilitation educators and others need to more clearly define guidelines relating to content of doctoral programs beyond the two-year minimum program of graduate work. It is estimated that a minimum of 15 percent of the graduates from rehabilitation counseling programs should be at the doctoral level in order to give leadership in administrative and supervisory positions, to fill research positions, and to supply teachers for rehabilitation counseling programs in colleges and universities.

Changing concepts of professional preparation and interdisciplinary aspects of preparation in rehabilitation counseling: In order to meet more adequately the needs of individuals with varying kinds of disabilities and from different segments of our society, there is an emphasis toward expanding the content of programs in rehabilitation counseling to include preparation in such areas as psychiatric rehabilitation, rehabilitation of the retarded, rehabilitation of the deaf, rehabilitation of the blind, and rehabilitation of the disabled offender against the law. Also, there is an emphasis on preparing doctoral level graduates for administration and supervision in rehabilitation, for research, and for leadership in community planning as well as for teaching in rehabilitation programs in institutions of higher learning.

The curriculum in rehabilitation counseling is being strengthened by (a) offering greater depth in preparation in the socio-cultural aspects of life and their relation to disability and rehabilitation; (b) improved methods of interdisciplinary communication on the part of the faculty and students; (c) greater selectivity in introducing content from a variety of other disciplines in the curriculum, based upon consideration of the principles underlying the adaptation of content from another field; (d) earlier introduction of supervised practice experiences in rehabilitation settings in order that the student can have opportunities to apply theory as he learns it; and (e) higher standards for supervised field experiences.

CHANGING CONCEPTS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND INTERDISCIPLINARY ASPECTS OF PREPARATION

Certain trends seem to be developing among staff members in colleges and universities throughout the country relating to the preparation of counselors. Among these trends are the following:

(1) There is a basic core of preparation for all counselors regardless of the setting in which they expect to work: This core centers around personality theory; a longitudinal approach to the study of human growth and development, with emphasis placed upon a deeper understanding of the age group with which the counselor expects to work; learning theory; vocational development theory; counseling theory; measurement and statistics, with an emphasis on the utilization of instruments of measurement to facilitate self-understanding; and research and evaluation. There is also a trend toward including in this core data processing and programming techniques. In addition, the core includes an emphasis on supervised practicum in individual and small group counseling with counselees from the age level and environmental setting in which the prospective counselor expects to work. There is a trend toward beginning these supervised experiences in counseling during the first year of graduate work and requiring a supervised internship in a setting appropriate to the prospective counselor's professional plans during the second year of graduate work.

There also is a greater emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach to the understanding of the personal, social, vocational, and educational needs of those from the various subcultures of our society.

(2) There is general agreement on the undesirability of preparing "academic counselors" and "vocational counselors," but there is also recognition of the fact that most counselors have not been prepared

sufficiently to help the potential early school leaver, the out-of-school youth, or the student who does not plan to continue formal education after high school. This has led to a recognition of the need (1) for more information about the areas of vocational and technical education, and (2) to develop among prospective counselors a more healthy attitude toward working with youth from various segments of our society in their efforts to make satisfactory vocational choices and educational plans.

With this trend toward the development of counselor education programs that more adequately prepare counselors to work with citizens of different intellectual abilities from various subcultures of our society, there is a feeling that funds for the preparation of counselors from various legislation passed by the Congress should be pooled when appropriate. For example, funds available under the Vocational Education Act for the preparation of counselors might be pooled with those funds available under the National Defense Education Act for the preparation of secondary and technical school counselors. Also, it is possible that funds, when made available for the preparation of Employment Service counselors, should be pooled with those being used to develop programs and prepare counselors for secondary and technical schools.

NEED FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STAFF MEMBERS

One of the most serious problems threatening the quality of the preparation of counselors is the increasing shortage of qualified doctoral level staff to teach in these programs. As previously stated, standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors indicate that there should be at least one FTE counselor educator for each eight FTE students. Further, the data already reported reveal that the institutions identified as having the strongest programs in the area of secondary counselor education had, during 1963-64, a ratio of one

FTE staff member to each fifteen FTE students. This over-loading of staff can only result in weakening seriously the quality of professional preparation provided in these programs.

It is estimated that the same ratio of staff to students (one to eight) is needed in each of the areas of counselor education already mentioned. Therefore, it is evident that drastic steps must be taken to prepare, at the doctoral level, additional counselor educators if programs for the education of counselors are to be strengthened and expanded in institutions of higher learning throughout the country.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

In general, it is recognized that programs for the professional preparation of school psychologists have not received widespread acceptance among professional groups. This is true for a number of reasons, among which are the following:

(1) Departments of psychology and departments of education in institutions of higher learning have not cooperated closely in developing strong programs of professional preparation for school psychologists.

(2) The role of the school psychologist is not clearly defined. The concept of the psychologist who is a consultant to the school program versus the school psychologist who has, through his preparation, gained a strong orientation in the area of professional education is still a basic issue that remains unresolved.

Until these and other issues are resolved by the profession, it will be most difficult for colleges and universities throughout the country to develop strong programs of professional preparation for school psychologists.

INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PREPARATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

There are 59 accredited schools of social work in the United States. Five schools which have been opened recently are working toward accreditation. All graduate schools of social work offer a minimum two-year program. Sixteen of these schools offer a doctoral program in social work. There is evidence of the widespread acceptance of standards of preparation for schools of social work. While there is not general agreement as to the extent to which these 59 schools could increase their output of students, 57 of the schools have indicated that they could enroll additional students if funds were available. A number of these schools could, at present, increase enrollments slightly if funds were available to support additional field work instruction. A recent report stated that 45 of these schools were unable to accept a total of nearly 1,000 students because of lack of staff, space, and other resources, including off-campus facilities for supervised practice.

At present, 18 states do not have schools of social work. It is estimated that an additional 20 schools of social work could be opened within the next five to ten years if funds for program development could be provided and if doctoral level staff members to teach in these schools could be prepared.

Changing concepts of professional preparation and interdisciplinary aspects of preparation: Within recent years, schools of social work have followed the policy of preparing students for social work practice in a generic way. Such preparation centers around a core of experiences relating to social welfare policy and services, human behavior in the social environment, and methods of social work practice. There is a balance between didactic instruction and supervised practice.

Much of social work practice and teaching is based on knowledge from the basic social sciences. In that sense, social work education can be considered interdisciplinary. Staff members are drawn from such areas of specialization outside the field of social work as research and human growth and behavior. As would be expected, however, most of the faculty of the schools of social work are professionally educated social workers.

SUBPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN COUNSELING AND RELATED HELPING RELATIONSHIP AREAS

Although there is general agreement that subprofessional personnel are needed to assist counselors, little has been accomplished toward: (1) Defining the limits of responsibility of subprofessional personnel; (2) Developing guidelines for programs of preparation for subprofessional personnel; and (3) Identifying agencies that are best suited to offer such preparation. Many counselor educators feel that a clearer identification of the role and preparation of subprofessional personnel might do much to discourage the practice in schools and other agencies of designating an individual as a counselor even though he may have had no professional preparation in the specific area of counseling. Also, it is recognized that much of the time of the professional counselor is now consumed by the performance of many subprofessional tasks.

The Counselor-Advisor University Summer Education (CAUSE) Program during the summer of 1964 was the first attempt on the part of a number of colleges and universities throughout the country to prepare subprofessional personnel (counselor aides and youth advisors) who would work in youth opportunity centers under the supervision of professional counselors. The lack of agreement among members of the profession concerning the nature of preparation for such subprofessional personnel caused much confusion. Leaders in counselor education, as well as in governmental and professional organizations, realize the need to identify (1) the tasks that should be performed only by the professional counselor, (2) the tasks that should be performed by subprofessional personnel working under the supervision of the counselor, (3) the kind of preparation needed by subprofessional personnel, and (4) the kind of agency best suited to give this preparation, for example, the junior college.

A number of helping relationship groups have developed statements concerning the role and preparation of subprofessional personnel. For example, rehabilitation counseling, physical therapy, nursing, and social work. Statements from these groups have important implications for the development of guidelines relating to the role and preparation of subprofessional personnel in counseling.

ISSUES RELATED TO A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF SALARY, METHODS OF SELECTION, WORKING CONDITIONS, SUPERVISION, AND MOBILITY UPON SELECTION, TRAINING, AND RETENTION OF COUNSELING PERSONNEL

by

S. Norman Feingold, National Director
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service

INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing recognition throughout the country by government, universities, and private agencies of the critical role of the emerging counseling profession. Counselors help individuals in a changing technological society to achieve meaningful work and life identity, and aid the country in developing and utilizing its human resources as effectively as possible, with the goal of producing ultimately responsible choice-making individuals.

The role of the counseling profession and its long and short-range objectives demand careful consideration. Professional competence has increased as a result of research and greater understanding in depth of counseling and personality theory. Increased demands for counseling at all levels are resulting in severe shortages of qualified personnel in almost every area. These shortages promise to increase rather than diminish over the next decade.

The profession of counseling in the United States today is characterized by a large and highly diversified group of practitioners working with people and problems in a wide variety of settings. Noticeable differences may be found within this group on almost any dimension from position titles and job descriptions to methods of selection, educational requirements, working conditions, supervision, and salary scales. Although there appear to be many areas of similarity among counselors, regardless of the agency or setting in which they work, the differences that do exist affect the ability of each group to recruit and retain professional personnel.

In light of present and future personnel shortages, it appears worth-while to examine some of these factors in order to consider their influence on selection, training, and retention of counseling personnel. The current status of major subgroups of counseling personnel in terms of salary schedules, methods of selection, working conditions, supervision, and mobility will be reviewed. How these factors influence the selection, training, and retention of counselors will be discussed. For purposes of this report, counselors will be grouped primarily according to place of employment.

VOCATIONAL COUNSELORS

State Employment Service Offices

Many employment counselors do vocational counseling in State employment offices. Vocational counselors, including employment counselors in State employment offices, help individuals develop and accept career goals that may create personal satisfaction. They help counselees by working with them in how to prepare for, enter, and progress in their work. Counseling in this setting most commonly relates to both short-run and long-term employment goals.

The Federal-State employment service has a network of approximately 2,000 local employment offices. These offices are under the general supervision of the Bureau of Employment Security, a Federal agency. However, the local employment offices are staffed and administered by 50 State employment services operating under varying State standards and personnel merit systems. In 1964 there were approximately 3,000 personnel on employment service staffs performing some counseling duties. Of these, about 1,700, or 58 percent, were spending 50 percent or more of their time in counseling activities. In 1958 a national survey showed 2,962 counselors of whom 981, or 33 percent, were spending half-time or more in counseling duties (73). While there has been a significant increase in the amount of time devoted to counseling, the total number of employment counselors has remained relatively unchanged. According to a recent Bureau of Employment Security survey, it is estimated that by mid-1969 at least 3,500 additional full-time counselors will be needed to maintain improved regular service (53).

Several recent pieces of legislation that directly involve the employment service will add further to projected shortages of counselors. President Johnson in early 1964 ordered that all eighteen year-old boys unable to meet the "mental" standards for induction into the Armed Forces were to be referred to State employment services for further testing and counseling. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 have placed upon the employment service personnel the duty of identifying those to be trained and of guiding them into the available training programs for which they are best suited. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will call upon the employment service personnel to interview and counsel youth in the process of selecting young people for a variety of work training programs. Counselors will have the chief role in the services to be provided through the Youth Opportunity Centers established by the employment service.

It is estimated that at least 2,000 to 3,000 more counselors will be needed in the next two years to handle these additional assignments. This is over and above the 3,500 necessary to carry on regular services by 1969.

Selection and Training. The generally accepted minimum educational requirement for employment counselors in State employment service offices is a bachelor's degree. A major in one of the social sciences, with some course work in counseling and psychology, personnel administration, education or public administration is considered desirable. Some States require at least 15 semester hours of counseling courses. In many States work experience may be substituted for some of the educational requirements (72).

The Select Subcommittee of Labor of the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor (54) conducted an investigation of current conditions in State employment service offices. According to their data, "a large gap exists between current educational levels of counselors and those which are being required." According to a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, of the 1,700 counselors spending at least half their work time in counseling, two-thirds held college degrees, 55 percent had passed 15 semester hours of university-level work in guidance and counseling related courses, and 12 percent had earned master's degrees. In about a fourth of the States, there were no personnel spending 50 percent or more of their time in counseling who held a master's degree (72).

In the future, far more than in the past, the trained counselor will have to perform a major function in the Federal-State employment service. The service, in order to measure up fully to its role of "manpower agency," will need to be staffed with an adequate number of men and women who have the intelligence, sensitivity, education, and training required for counseling in depth of workers in our complex, technological society. The employment counselor's specialty is perhaps not as well known or understood as it should be.

In recent years, the Bureau of Employment Security has made recommendations for upgrading the educational qualifications of employment counselors in State agencies (53). In 1964 it recommended that State employment service agencies adopt the following job classifications: Counselor Intern; Journeyman Counselor; and, Master Counselor.

The minimum requirements for *Counselor Interns* would be a bachelor's degree, including 15 semester hours of undergraduate or graduate study in specified counseling-related courses. The position of *Journeyman Counselor* would require a master's degree in the guidance and counseling area, or at least 30 hours of university level graduate study in specified counseling-related courses. The *Master Counselor would require* a master's degree, plus 3 years of work experience in counseling, one of which must be as an employment service counselor. The Bureau of Employment Security has set a target date of July 1968. At that time *all* personnel in the State employment service offices holding the job classification of Counselor must have completed the formal educational requirements listed under Journeyman Counselor (53). Currently, almost 90 percent of the present counselors (half-time or more) do not have the educational qualifications that the Bureau of Employment Security wishes all Journeyman Counselors to attain *within less than 4 years from now*.

The employment service is attempting to upgrade the qualifictions of its present staff. At the same time it must also attempt to greatly expand the size of its staff to meet future shortages. It must do this at the same time that other major employers of professional counseling personnel are trying to build up their own staffs. Schools, private agencies, and the employment service, for example, seek to attract people of basically similar abilities and interests. Both rely heavily upon the same limited supply of university training facilities to produce professional counselors. Both the Bureau of Employment Security and various local employment offices have made attempts to upgrade and augment staff through the use of short-term, intensive training programs and in-service supervisory techniques.

Project CAUSE was a program sponsored by the Bureau of Employment Security of the U. S. Department of Labor during the summer of 1964. It was aimed at creating a pool of approximately 2,000 men and women with brief but intensive task-focused training. The goal was to prepare them for working as subprofessionals under the supervision of counselors in Youth Opportunity Centers to be established by the Bureau of Employment Security. Twenty-seven universities were involved in this short-term, intensive training program, and were financed with funds from the M.D.T.A. Successful trainees were designated as Counselor Aides and Youth Advisors. Only college graduates were eligible for the Counselor Aide designation.

The response of applicants was unexpectedly strong. More than 20,000 persons took the screening examination. From these candidates the Bureau of Employment Security selected 2,000 recruits for the program. Of those selected, approximately 1,700 completed the program with a satisfactory level of performance. By December 1964, about 1,000 of the "graduates" were employed by various State employment services, or were making arrangements to accept positions. The large majority are expected to be assigned to Youth Opportunity Centers as these Centers come into operation.

The Project CAUSE experience demonstrated the existence of a large supply of people, particularly among recent college graduates, who are interested in counseling work and are potentially trainable as qualified counselors. This intensive short-term program is not to be considered a substitute for the general qualifications of professional counselors. Its present existence is basically in response to an emergency situation.

Supervision in the State employment offices varies greatly (74). The thrust has been in recent years toward a more professional approach. Supervision is provided for counselors at the local, State, and regional levels. In small offices, technical supervision may not be available at the local level. In these instances, it is available from the District or State office. At the State level, there is a State supervisor of counseling. One person at the regional level is assigned to give technical assistance in testing, counseling, and supervision. At the regional level, university people are also called in as consultants for necessary supervisory responsibilities. In various local offices, both in and out-service training is provided. Role playing, monitoring, and sitting in on case discussions, are a few of the varying techniques employed by different employment offices. Universities, such as the University of Missouri, have special summer courses for professional growth of employment counselors. Universities with similar programs are the University of North Dakota and the University of Mississippi.

The State employment service is now using approximately 80 to 100 area counselors. These counselors are responsible for 2 to 3 small offices where they render technical assistance. The counselor is based in one office and fans out to 1 or 2 other offices to give needed assistance. It is expected that area counselors' responsibilities will be expanded to include supervision.

Congress has not as yet considered taking any concerted action to deal with the shortage of employment service counselors that it has made more acute by its own recent legislation. Professor C. Gilbert Wrenn of Arizona State University pointed out to the Subcommittee (54):

> It is ironic, indeed, to consider the number of new responsibilities recently given the employment service, the execution of which requires additional counseling, with no specific provision made for the augmentation of staff. If the legislation required additional physicians, or nurses, or medical technologists, or teachers, or computer programmers,

it is likely that attention would have been given to supplying specific funds for new staff. Not so with counselors.

There are problems beyond that posed by the existing shortage of counselors. There is the inevitable time lag in training enough people to eliminate this shortage. There is also the serious problem of providing adequate incentive for capable individuals to take counseling positions with the employment service and remain in them on a long-term career basis. Several interrelated factors seem to be creating this problem in State employment security agencies: present salaries, level of job prestige, and working conditions.

The Subcommittee's study shows that present salary levels for employment service counselors are a major obstacle to the service's attempts to strengthen its counseling staff (54). Low entry salaries reduce the service's capacity to recruit counselors. Low maximum salaries make it difficult for the service to retain some of its best qualified counselors.

Dr. Arthur Hitchcock, representing the APGA testified: "It is a truism, that when an employment service counselor becomes well-trained, he goes to a counseling position outside of the employment service simply because his salary is inadequate for a professionally trained person" (54).

A May 1964 survey, by the Bureau of Employment Security of salaries paid to about 1,700 State employment service personnel performing counseling duties more than 50 percent of their time, showed the average (arithmetic mean) salary to be $6,095. Of the 50 States, the lowest average salary reported was $5,054 in Maryland. The State reporting the highest average salary (with the exception of Alaska) was Utah at $7,410. Only 4 States, Alaska, Utah, California, and Arizona, paid an average salary of more than $7,000. For 50 States as a whole the range of salaries in May 1964 ran from $3,819 to $9,550. Only 22 States reported a salary of more than $7,000 for their highest paid counselors. No State, other than Utah, reported any counselor in its employment service with a salary above $9,000 (65).

There has been some improvement in the salary position of counselors, partly as a result of leadership from the Bureau of Employment Security. Of the 50 States, 46 now have established separate higher salary classifications for counselors as opposed to job placement interviewers. There is a general reluctance on the part of State Civil Service authorities to allow employment service counselors' salaries that may match or even exceed those of the managers of the local employment offices. As of July 1964, the average maximum base salary for office managers in the 50 State agencies was approximately $7,600. A national survey of State counseling supervisors listed as of May 1, 1964, shows that the median salary was $8,112. The annual salaries currently being paid State counseling supervisors ranged from $5,700 to $13,718 (73).

The prestige attached to a position is a partial function of salary. It is also a function of certain non-monetary aspects of the position. The specialty of employment service counselors is regarded by some counselors as having low status among the members of the counseling profession. This is partly the result of a lower average level of formal education and training of employment service counselors. Low status may also be derived from general working conditions and from the general image of some employment service offices.

In some local employment offices, persons with counseling assignments are frequently taken away from counseling work at seasonal peaks of unemployment. They are assigned to the relatively routinized task of handling claims for unemployment compensation benefits. Some local offices do not have private offices in which counselors may conduct interviews. A survey by the Bureau of Employment Security indicated that 61 percent of counselors do not have private offices or partitioned space for interviewing and counseling (53). Many counselors share crowded offices with several other staff members, most of whom may be processing unemployment insurance claims.

In some agencies with insufficient staff the nature of the counseling service provided to individual counselees tends to be excessively hurried and limited. Testimony to the Committee revealed that during an eight-hour day in some offices, counselors are expected to conduct as many as 12 or 13 interviews. An average of 6 interviews has been suggested as a maximum for adequate service (54).

Related to the brevity of counseling interviews is the limited number of interviews available to individuals, particularly those with complex employment problems. During 1964 there was an average of about 1.7 interviews for each person counseled. This number has been judged insufficient.

In the past the employment service seems to have been excessively preoccupied with measuring its achievements by the number of job placements. The counseling function has a longer time perspective than a job placement function. The benefits of counseling cannot be easily demonstrated, measured, and statistically reported. These benefits may be undervalued in any analysis of employment service activities that concentrates upon the volume of current job placements.

An unfavorable and unfair picture of the employment service office is still embedded in the minds of some employers and workers. The local employment office may be regarded as the "unemployment office." Many workers know little about aptitude testing and counseling facilities available at the employment office. Some of the recent controversy as to the role, status, and function of the State employment service, as reported in at least one popular magazine, may have hurt the professional image of the service.

The professional affiliation of employment service counselors, in a survey reported in November 1964, was identified as follows: 55 percent - International Association of Personnel in Employment Security (IAPES); 17 percent - active in local and State personnel and guidance associations; 7 percent - in 30 States identified with the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), and the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA). Lesser numbers indicated affiliation with the National Rehabilitation Association (NRA), the National Education Association (NEA), the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), and the American Psychological Association (APA) (73).

Mobility. In addition to limitations of upward mobility for counselors within each agency, due to restrictions in salary scales, there is also the problem encountered in transferring from one office to an office in another State.

No process has been worked out whereby a competent individual, who has had years of work with the employment service in one State, may move to a position in the employment service of another State and receive the seniority, work, and salary appropriate to his experience. Women make up a substantial portion of skilled counselors (approximately one-half). They are often required to move from one State to another as their husbands are transferred or change jobs. The mobility of workers today, and the counseling profession in particular, is well documented (See Appendix A).

The Federal-State employment service is faced with a wide array of complex problems. Let us now consider other counseling settings.

Office of Economic Opportunity

The Office of Economic Opportunity was established under provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It is in the preliminary stages of the recruiting and training of counselors for various Job Corps Centers to be established. These Centers are to be maintained for youth disadvantaged by prejudice, poverty, and cultural deprivation. Estimates for 1966 indicate that approximately 200 to 300 counselors for Conservation Centers will be recruited.

Selection standards are varied in terms of education and experience. Three levels of personnel are being recruited: non-professional counseling assistants, professional counselors, and deputy directors for education. Salaries for Conservation Center counselors are based on the Federal Civil Service ratings and schedules.

For non-professional counseling assistants, entrance requirements include a B.A. plus six years of related counseling experience. They will be paid the GS-9 salary which ranges from $7,220 to $9,425.

Professional counselors and deputy directors of education will have had intensive experience in counseling settings such as schools, private agencies, employment agencies, etc. Professional counselor qualifications include an M.A. or M.S.W. plus four years of experience for a GS-11 rating ($8,650 to $11,305). A deputy director hired at the GS-12 level will require an M.A. and four years of experience. This includes at least one year's experience in administration of an educational program. The GS-12 salary range is $10,250 to $13,445. GS ratings are the rule in Conservation Centers. In Urban Training Centers for Men and Job Corps Centers for Women, counselors are hired by the individual contractors who set standards for hiring within limits of the contractual agreement.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is conducting in-service training programs. In addition to regular teaching and demonstration sessions, they are using short films (which they have made themselves) to acquaint counselors with the problems and most appropriate techniques. Training programs emphasize a wide range of intensity that counseling may encompass. "Counseling" may be as simple as an encouraging pat on the back, or as intensive as long-term psychotherapy. Counselors are encouraged to meet the client at his own level and gear service to each person's individual needs. They work and live in close proximity with their clients.

A Job Corps Counselor Manual has been prepared. Topics include The Role of the Counselor, Counseling Procedures, and Special Counseling Problems. Supplements, deletions, and revisions will be supplied. Counselors are to be provided with office space for private interviews. Security of records is assured. Space will be available for group counseling and testing.

Counselors receive and provide supervision. One or two counselors will be assigned to any one Job Corps Center. Part of their responsibilities involve supervision of some teachers in aspects of their work that pertain to counseling. Counselors will receive supervision from regional level offices and consultants at universities.

Private and Community Agencies

Another group of vocational counselors are employed in various private and community agencies, offering educational and vocational counseling, primarily in the larger cities. There are approximately 1,000 vocational counselors employed in these private and community agencies (72). Major personnel shortages are anticipated in the coming years. It is estimated that within the next five years they will require at least a 150 percent increase in the number of counselors employed. Since the type of work done in these agencies is akin to that of the State employment service offices, both of these groups will be competing for comparable personnel.

Entrance Requirements. Private and community agencies have not agreed upon minimum entrance requirements for counselors. However, most of them prefer, and many require a master's degree in psychology, guidance, personnel administration, social work, education, or public administration. Many private agencies prefer to have at least one staff member with a Ph.D. in counseling or a related field. For those lacking an advanced degree, employers often emphasize experience in closely related work such as rehabilitation counseling, employment interviewing, school or college counseling, or teaching. The emphasis in many private agencies is upon long-range, vocational goals with intensive analysis, work-up, and counseling procedures.

In recent years more and more private and community agencies have been voluntarily seeking approval from the American Board on Counseling Services, an independent board, established by the American Personnel and Guidance Association. The Board evaluates the standards and practices of agencies or individuals and determines whether they are qualified to provide professional counseling services. Those that are approved are listed in the Directory of Approved Counseling Agencies (19). Among criteria used are certain standards of professional education and experience. Those agencies wishing either to gain or retain approved status must employ professional staff with certain minimum training requirements. For example, agency directors are required to have at least 60 graduate credits, including a master's degree. The professional standards required for agency approval by the American Board have shown a steady increase since its establishment in 1957. The following breakdown of agencies appears in the latest edition of the Directory of Approved Counseling Agencies:

Private agencies	36%
Religious-affiliated, including B'nai B'rith, Jewish Vocational, YMCA, YWCA, and others	18%

College or university affiliated:	
Public	19%
Private	13%
Religious	9%
Other public agencies	5%
	100%

Because of the current shortages of counseling personnel with sufficient or appropriate education, all private and community agencies carry on some in-service training programs. Since private agencies are not always able to hire their first or second choice candidates, they have been accepting people at lower levels of training and experience in the hope they will grow professionally within the agency. In many private and community agencies, in- and out-service training programs are conducted. The small community counseling agency has shown unusual flexibility in meeting the changes in counselor functions and procedures. Intensive supervision is emphasized. Block reading of cases, play-back and discussions of tape recordings of counseling session, internship and field work, and the use of community and university resource personnel are a frequent means of in-service training for community agencies.

Internship programs at private agencies provide university students with current knowledge of field operations. They are also a source of staff recruitment. Some private counseling agencies have a field-work or practicum relationship with one or more universities. Professional agency staff members may take university courses for credit without tuition charge. This arrangement keeps private agency professional workers informed of latest theory and knowledge at the university level. Counseling staff also make use of the educational and vocational libraries in private agencies which tend to be at a high level of professional quality.

Counselors are encouraged to attend professional meetings. They are urged to become familiar with and involved in any research or demonstration projects being conducted by that agency. Some agencies also try to assist counselors in pursuing further formal education by allowing "time off" from the regular work day for university attendance. However, staff shortages make this somewhat difficult. There is no specific legislation which covers training grants for personnel employed in private and community agencies.

Salaries. There is considerable variation in salaries in private and community agencies in terms of minimum and maximum amounts. Many private agencies have a personnel practices code in which salary details are spelled out. Generally speaking, the range is much greater than in the State employment agencies, especially at the upper levels of salary. Limited opportunities for advancement to supervisory or executive positions are available in some private and community agencies.

At present, the average minimum entrance salary for counselors in private agencies is about $5,500. The average maximum salary for a staff counselor is about $11,000. However, for supervisors and directors, salaries range from $9,000 to $20,000 a year, depending on the size, location, and total budget of the agency.

In the future, a chief limitation on the expansion of both private and community agencies will be the availability of funds. These agencies are primarily dependent upon the allocation of private or community funds which may be limited because of competing community agency demands for the philanthropic dollar. The growth of many private agencies in recent years has been considerably and primarily enhanced by the allocation of certain Federal and State funds. In the future these funds may become even more important.

A survey was recently conducted of a 25 percent random sample of counseling agencies approved by the American Board on Counseling Services and listed in the 1965-66 Directory of Approved Counseling Services. These agencies were asked to comment on what they regarded as the most important weaknesses in their services and facilities as part of a form required to be completed by all agencies for approval status. The data collected may be summarized as follows:

1. Shortages of staff members because of increased demands for service.
2. Lack of time and facilities for research and followup work to learn more about effectiveness of the services.

3. Limitation on expansion because of lack of physical space and insufficient funds.

4. Salary schedules below competitive levels.

A number of surveys of employers in private and community vocational counseling agencies indicate that salaries tend to play a major role in selection and retention of qualified personnel. Rising standards for education and experience are helping to raise the professional competence of personnel in these agencies. They are at the same time enhancing the shortages of qualified counselors now available. In certain private denominational agencies, another factor affects selectivity - that is, the religion of the counselor who participates at a policy level becomes a crucial factor. Generally speaking, in those agencies where salaries are most competitive, the counseling staff tends to have the best training, and turnover rates appear lowest. In those agencies with the lowest salary scales, turnover rates for well-trained counselors appear the highest. Counselors tend to leave these agencies in order to find employment in other areas - private industry, government, etc., where salaries are most in keeping with their level of training.

In recent years, a number of private agency directors and supervisors have moved on to the universities where they believe they have opportunities for greater creativity, challenge, and prestige. In a considerable number of private agencies, key guidance personnel have voluntarily left for administrative work in and out of the counseling profession. Other highly experienced and sensitive counselors not interested in administrative positions have left their jobs in order to obtain similar positions at a higher salary level. A study by the APGA showed that 38 percent of counselors seeking positions were willing to move anywhere (see Appendix A). Another factor which tends to influence mobility in private agencies is the increasing tendency for specialization in type of service provided. Candidates are then attracted to a particular agency offering, for example, rehabilitation, youth work, etc.

The three settings which we have already presented show a number of important similarities as well as differences. Let us now consider another group of employment settings.

REHABILITATION COUNSELORS

The rehabilitation counselor is a professional person who is concerned with the total adjustment of the individual handicapped by disease or disability. He is specifically involved with the individual's occupational adjustment. Rehabilitation counselors are employed in State vocational rehabilitation agencies, voluntary community agencies, rehabilitation centers, hospital rehabilitation centers, the public employment service, special schools, insurance companies, sheltered workshops, and a wide variety of rehabilitation programs in public and private welfare or public health agencies.

The kind of agency in which the rehabilitation counselor is employed determines to a large extent what he does. He is usually concerned with evaluation of the vocational potential of the disabled individual. He often arranges for medical care, training and other needed rehabilitation services with selective job placement agencies.

State and Local Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies

Every State provides a public rehabilitation program that is financed cooperatively with Federal and State funds. As of 1964, there were 90 of these agencies throughout the country. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (72), there are at present approximately 3,600 full-time rehabilitation counselors employed in the United States. These counselors hold membership primarily in the ARCA division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the recently formed NCRA division within the National Rehabilitation Association. Both groups show an increasing concern for vigorous, professional growth and development. Approximately three-fourths or 2,600 are employed in the State Public Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. An estimated 20 percent of all rehabilitation counselors are women. For a number of years these agencies have been faced with mounting shortages of trained personnel. Estimates indicate that the extent of these shortages will increase in the next decade.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration estimates that over 2 million persons in the nation now need rehabilitation counseling. Several factors contribute substantially to the long-run demand for services of rehabilitation counselors. Population growth increases the number of handicapped to be served. Vocational rehabilitation is being extended to more difficult and chronic disabilities. It is anticipated that increases in public and private funds will be allocated to these services because of the increasing support for social welfare in general. There is a growing awareness that expenditures for rehabilitation are often returned as savings on appropriations for programs involving health and custodial care, public assistance, and other types of welfare.

The National Rehabilitation Association recently completed a study (63) of the nature and extent of the personnel shortage in the field of rehabilitation counseling. This project was initiated in an effort to find ways of eliminating the shortages. According to their survey, the demand for new rehabilitation counselors in both public VR and private rehabilitation agencies during 1965-66 is estimated at 700 to 1,000. From 1967 into the early 1970's, the demand for new rehabilitation counselors will increase to an average of 900 to 1,200 each year. These estimates apply only to those people whom public and private rehabilitation agencies will need to employ. When consideration is given to personnel demands in special schools, hospitals, and other community organizations serving the handicapped, the estimates will probably double. These annual demands exceed considerably the number of counselors presently being trained and entering the field.

The Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study (63) identified a number of factors which have contributed to the recruitment problem, and came up with several recommendations.

Selection and Training. At present, there are no uniform requirements as to the specific kind and amount of education needed to qualify for work in this field. There is no general system of certification. The general requirements usually include graduation from a college or university with course credits in counseling, psychology, and related fields, and/or related work experience. In approximately three-fourths of the State rehabilitation agencies, applicants are required to comply with State civil service and merit system rules. Candidates must take a competitive written examination. This is sometimes supplemented by an individual interview and evaluation by a board of examiners. A few States require counselors to be residents of the State in which they work.

As a result of the public's increased demands for higher quality service, and the concurrent drive toward professionalization among all groups of counselors, increasing emphasis is being placed on more and better training for rehabilitation counselors.

In an effort to improve and standardize the education and training of rehabilitation counselors, graduate school training programs in rehabilitation counseling were initiated in 1954 as a result of Public Law 565. According to the U. S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in 1964 38 colleges and universities offered financial assistance to a limited number of graduate students specializing in rehabilitation. Training grants were sponsored by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. These training programs are located mainly in departments of education and psychology.

As of September 1963, 25 of these programs required 2 full academic years for completion, and 9 required from 1 and 1/2 to 2 academic years. All of these programs require an internship or supervised work in a rehabilitation setting.

TABLE I

LEVEL OF REHABILITATION COUNSELOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
1964 - 1965 ACADEMIC YEAR

Level	Number of Institutions
Undergraduate	1
Less than two academic years	2a/
Two academic years	25
More than two years but less than doctoral	--
Doctoral	17

a/ One is 15 months; the other is 3 semesters.

According to the NRA survey (63), approximately 370 VRA-sponsored graduates will enter the labor market during 1964.

(The above and following tables were prepared by the Division of Training, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 8, 1965.)

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF ENROLLMENT DATA
ACADEMIC YEAR 1964-65

Number of full-time students in rehabilitation counselor educational programs	Number of programs
None	1
Less than 10	3
10 - 19	8
20 - 29	12
30 - 39	7
40 - 49	4
50 and above	2
Not reported	1
Total	38

Assuming that these programs will continue to grow as they have in the past, an estimated 400 - 450 graduate rehabilitation counselors can be expected from the training programs each year for the next two years. During the same period the demand for rehabilitation counselors is estimated to be between 700 and 1,000 per year. However, according to past experience and follow-up studies, not all of these graduates can be expected to enter employment in public VR or private rehabilitation agencies.

The Counselor Recruitment Study (63) reveals that of the counselors currently employed in public VR agencies, slightly less than 3 out of 5 have a bachelor's degree but no advanced degree; 2 out of 5 have a master's degree; and slightly less than 1 out of 5 has a master's degree from a VRA-sponsored graduate school training program in rehabilitation counseling. In private rehabilitation agencies which were included in the survey, 2 out of 3 counselors have a master's degree from a VRA-sponsored graduate school training program in rehabilitation counseling.

While these VRA training programs are being looked to as a major source of manpower, their current output of graduates is roughly equal to the turnover rate among employed counselors. Employing agencies must continue to rely on traditional sources of manpower, such as recruits from the field of education, welfare departments, the employment service, industrial personnel workers, etc. The situation is complicated further by the fact that the fields representing the traditional sources of manpower for rehabilitation counseling are themselves experiencing keen competition for personnel.

Salary. In addition to the presently insufficient number of applicants with desired training, both the State VR agencies and private agencies listed low salaries as one of their major problem areas in attracting and retaining competent personnel.

In another study conducted by NRA, the directors of the 90 State agencies were asked what factors they considered most important for the improvement of VR services. The factors ranked most frequently among the first three were:

1. More rehabilitation counselors (55 agencies);
2. More money in budget (39 agencies); and,
3. Higher salaries for counselors (29 agencies).

As of July 1964, rehabilitation counselors employed by the State VR agencies were earning the following salaries (65):

1. Mean mimimum salary - $5,791; and,
2. Mean maximum salary - $7,269.

Salaries for all States ranged from a low of $3,960 to a high of $9,060. Only 19 States had a minimum salary above $6,000. Only 12 States listed maximum salaries above $8,000. Administrators of vocational rehabilitation programs generally earn more than $10,000 annually.

On the average, the salary ranges for rehabilitation counselors are approximately $500 a year higher than for employment service counselors. However, in 8 States there is a higher salary range for employment service counselors (13, 14). These relatively low salary schedules for both groups of counselors tend to be producing the same concomitant problems of initial recruitment and subsequent retention.

The Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study indicates that both State and private rehabilitation agencies suffer from rather high turnover rates (63). In public agencies, the average turnover rate during the past 3 years was 8.5 percent. In private agencies for the same period, the turnover rate was 17 percent. Salary scales seem to influence upward mobility and advancement opportunities. According to the study, in many agencies the better rehabilitation counselors who have reached the top of the counselor's salary and promotional schedule are promoted out of rehabilitation counseling per se and into administration. This does not imply that administrative positions should not be filled with people experienced as rehabilitation counselors. It should be noted that this is virtually the only means for counselors to advance significantly in their agencies.

Other Problem Areas. Another major problem area cited by both the public VR and private agencies was the lack of an adequate and efficient system of communication between employers and job applicants (especially with out-of-town applicants). A national clearing house system listing available jobs and available applicants was suggested as one way of dealing with this problem.

The NRA study revealed that the VRA-sponsored training programs themselves are facing major problems as they attempt to meet the demand from the field for rehabilitation counselors (63). These problems are:

1. Lack of public knowledge concerning rehabilitation counseling as a career, and opportunities that exist for graduate training in this area.
2. Lack of information concerning long-range demands for rehabilitation counseling personnel.

3. Lack of information concerning the national employment possibilities for their graduates.
4. The limited number of people trained at the doctoral level that are available to staff the graduating training programs.

A number of recommendations were included in the study. One of these concerned the initiation of a 5-year experimental program for recruitment and placement of personnel. As part of this program it was recommended that a national placement service be established for the field of rehabilitation counseling. This national service would seek (1) listings and descriptions of job openings, and (2) registrations and descriptions of job candidates, and would facilitate the rapid exchange of this information between employers and job candidates. The establishment of this national placement service is contemplated during the coming year.

The following are some of the other recommendations which grew out of the study:

1. Initiate steps aimed at substantially increasing the capacity of graduate school training programs in rehabilitation counseling.
2. Develop policies and procedures to assist those currently employed as rehabilitation counselors to complete their master's degree training.
3. Develop and/or expand in-service training programs.
4. Initiate the efforts of all persons and groups in positions of leadership within the rehabilitation movement to:
    - (a) Convince hiring agencies, State civil service commissions and boards of private agencies of the need to raise salaries of rehabilitation counselors to a level commensurate with their increased responsibilities and added professional training.
    - (b) Extend the opportunities for advancement by instituting a position of "Career Counselor" to which rehabilitation counselors could aspire after reaching the maximum salary level within current classifications.

(c) Increase the status and job satisfaction of the counselor by emphasizing the professional aspects of his work.

These recommendations indicate that higher salaries, increased training facilities and greater advancement opportunities tend to be the crucial factors for consideration in terms of both recruitment and retention of rehabilitation counselors.

Let us now consider the employment setting of the counselor in the Veterans Administration, particularly since it offers a number of contrasts to the setting we have just considered.

Veterans Administration

The Veterans Administration conducts rehabilitation counseling in two different departments - the Department of Veterans Benefits and the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Both of these departments hire only counseling psychologists. As of 1964 there were approximately 140 counseling psychologists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery and around 175 in the VA Vocational Rehabilitation program (part of Department of Veterans Benefits) (72).

These personnel are doing rehabilitation counseling, either with disabled veterans or with eligible sons and daughters of deceased or totally and permanently disabled veterans. They are not referred to as counselors. Their title is Counseling Psychologist. This difference in title has further implications with respect to professional affiliation, amount and level of training and salary.

Minimum entrance requirements in both VA departments are well above those for State and private rehabilitation agencies. In the Department of Medicine and Surgery, all practitioners must have a Ph.D. in psychology or a closely related field, plus experience in the field of counseling in a medical setting. In the Department of Veterans Benefits, the minimum entrance qualification is 60 graduate hours in specified areas, primarily counseling and psychology. A Ph.D. degree is preferred but not always required of applicants.

Higher training requirements are accompanied by higher salaries. They are considerably higher than the salary scales for rehabilitation counselors in

State VR and private rehabilitation agencies. In the Department of Veterans Benefits, counseling psychologists are employed at the following Civil Service grade levels and salary ranges (75):

1. Psychologists with 2 years of qualifying counseling experience may be employed at GS-11 with beginning salary of $8,650.
2. Psychologists with 3 or more years of qualifying counseling experience are employed at GS-12. In this grade, salaries begin at $10,250 and may be increased periodically to as high as $13,445 over a period of years.
3. Some Counseling Psychologists may be promoted to supervisory positions (e.g., Chief of Vocational Counseling, Training and Adjustment Section) in VA regional offices at GS-13. The salary range in this grade runs from $12,075 to $15,855.

In contrast to conditions in State and private rehabilitation agencies, the duties of the counselor as well as facilities to be provided are specified in detail by the Veterans Administration (75). Factors such as recommended size of case load, nature of supervision, and allowances for additional training are detailed as follows: Continuing administrative control is maintained over the size of the case load assigned to individual counselors. This is to avoid a processing rate so high as to adversely affect quality of work. Each month the first-line technical supervisor reviews appropriate samples of staff work, judging the quality of staff performance in terms of applicable quality requirements. He encourages individual counselors to check samples of their own work against quality requirements. Cooperative action among staff members is fostered and utilized. Particular note is made of those areas of practice in which there is need for improvement. Improvement is sought in identified areas through a staff development program. This includes individual professional study, in-service training, consultation, and in some instances, formal training.

In the VA there are no severe personnel shortages anticipated in the future and no apparent recruitment problems at present. The VA has experienced little difficulty in recruiting employees. Turnover has been extremely low. In the Department of Veterans Benefits, over 50 percent of the staff presently employed are over 55 and approaching retirement. This factor has been cited as a major reason for recruiting new counselors in the next few years (72).

The discrepancies in level of training, salaries, and working conditions between these two groups of rehabilitation counselors are apparent. Most of the recommendations called for by the Counselor Recruitment Study (63) are already in effect in the VA rehabilitation programs. However, staff or potential staff with all or most of the requirements for the Ph.D. in psychology or counseling, are in shorter supply than those with a limited number of graduate credits in a variety of counseling and related courses.

Let us now move from a relatively small group of counselors to the very largest.

SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Public Elementary and Secondary Schools

School counselors are by far the largest single group engaged in counseling in this country. School counselors are team members of the educational staff of their school systems. They are employed mainly in public secondary schools and in State Departments of Education. School counselors help students carry out plans for education and work. They also help students in understanding and adjusting to their social and school environment. In addition, counselors work with classroom teachers, school psychologists, administrators, private and public agencies, and with parents to further the growth and development of individuals.

Counselors at the junior and senior high school level spend most of their professional time helping students in selecting courses that fit in with their career or college plans. Some counselors also work in elementary schools and in institutions of higher learning. Systematic information and research concerning these latter two groups is at present very difficult to obtain. The latter group of counselors are a relatively new innovation in counseling. The standards for selection, training, working conditions, and supervision have not yet been crystalized.

The U. S. Office of Education reports that as of 1964-65 approximately 42,000 persons were performing some counseling functions in the public secondary schools (72). Of these, approximately 21,000 were full-time counselors, while the rest were doing counseling on a part-time basis.

It is this largest group of counselors that is experiencing the greatest personnel shortages, both present and projected. According to the following estimates, the number of new persons needed as counselors in the next few years indicates the tremendous unfilled needs.

In 1963, the U. S. Office of Education estimated that there was a shortage of 20,000 counselors, based on the desired ratio of 1 counselor to 300 students (at the secondary school level). The present ratio is approximately 1:500, with much variation among regions. Each of the following six Regional Accrediting Associations recognizes guidance and personnel services in its most recent accreditation manual (67):

California Association of Secondary School Administrators;
Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools;
New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools;
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools;
Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools; and
Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

There is also variation in recommended ratio by regional accrediting associations. For example, 3 associations do not mention ratios in their accreditation manual. In others, the recommended ratios range from 1:300 to 1:500 (67). The greatest shortages tend to exist in low-income areas where the desirable ratio might well be about 1 to 50. Based on the 1:300 ratio, the total number of secondary school counselors needed by 1966 is 54,300, and by 1970 it will be 59,920 (12).

When we consider the establishment of guidance programs in public *elementary* as well as secondary schools, the total number of school counselors needed as of 1963-64 becomes approximately 95,447; that is (12),

Kindergarten to Grade 6 (1:600 ratio)	38,600
Grades 7 - 8 elementary (1:300 ratio)	5,824
Grades 7 -12 secondary (1:300 ratio)	51,023

Selection and Training. Generally speaking, there is and has been only one source of school counselors. Almost without exception, they have been recruited from the ranks of the teaching profession. The vast majority of full-time counselors are former teachers. Part-time counselors are also doing part-time teaching (8).

A limitation on the potential source of school counseling personnel is based on principally two factors: (1) State certification requirements for school counselors; and, (2) certain stipulations included in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its amendments.

According to the U. S. Office of Education, 47 States plus the District of Columbia require school counselors to meet the standards for a State teaching certificate to qualify for full professional certification (72). In addition to this requirement, all States issue certificates for school counseling only to those applicants who meet certain minimum qualifications concerning training and experience in the counseling and guidance field. Thirty-nine States stipulate a master's degree or 30 semester hours of graduate training in counselor education. Experience requirements for such certification range from one to five years of teaching experience. Some States require at least one year of work experience outside the teaching field (66). Data from the Project Talent Survey of 1960 indicated that at that time 41.6 percent of all counselors were certified or licensed by their State (25). It should be noted that 37 States issue certificates at more than one level. However, between States there is a certain amount of confusion as to the terminology employed to designate different types and levels of certification, and requirements and content of the certificates themselves.

In Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Congress sought to expand local guidance programs and to train more school counselors. Part A of Title V authorized an annual Federal appropriation of $15 million for grants to State educational agencies to help them establish and maintain programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. In order to receive these grants each State had to submit a State plan which included both minimum and recommended standards for approving local programs of guidance and counseling. These standards include: the qualifictions for local school guidance positions, the guidance and counseling activities to be provided, the counselor-student ratio, and the physical facilities, equipment and materials.

Part B of Title V authorized the U. S. Commissioner of Education to contract with colleges and universities for the establishment and conducting of short-term and regular-session institutes. These institutes were designed to improve the qualifications of counselors in public secondary schools, and to train teachers in such schools who are preparing to engage in counseling and guidance (12).

During the first 5 years of the NDEA, 328 summer institutes were conducted, enrolling 11,043 persons. Eighty-eight institutes during the regular academic year enrolled 2,741 people. Through this help from the NDEA, the number of full-time equivalent counselors jumped 127 percent in the first 5 years from 12,000 to 27,000. At the same time, the counselor-student ratio dropped from 1:960 to 1:530 (12).

The NDEA has been the major force in supplementing the supply of school counselors. In the vast majority of State plans submitted under the NDEA, minimum standards were identical or higher than the State certification requirements. The all-pervasive requirement for the teaching certificate has become incorporated in the NDEA. The people who are able to take advantage of the special training institutes are school personnel.

To quote from the 1964 Statement of Policy by the APGA on the professional preparation and role of the counselor (67):

> Counseling is an evolving profession which must continually evaluate its standards of preparation and performance...
>
> Counselor education programs...should be related to the tasks to be performed - to the professional role of the counselor in the setting in which he is likely to work.
>
> Prerequisites for entry into the counselor preparation program should be relevant, and should be systematically evaluated and revised whenever there is evidence that change is desirable.
>
> Procedures and standards for selection should be sufficiently flexible to recognize that there may be alternate ways of demonstrating possession of the qualities or background deemed necessary for admission.

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision in 1960 launched a five-year Planning Cooperative Study of Counselor Education Standards. The guidelines it established which institutions of higher learning could use to evaluate programs of preparation for secondary school counselors have been a major force in the growth of counselor education (40). A full report is available (40). There are more than 200 institutions in the United States offering graduate preparation in counseling.

Mobility. With his present level of education and preparation, the school counselor has a rather unique position in terms of mobility. His better than average training and experience make him a desirable recruit for employers of vocational and/or rehabilitation counselors in many types of settings. Counselors who may have an equivalent amount of graduate training and experience, but who lack a teaching certificate are prevented from becoming school counselors. One might expect quite a high turnover rate among school counselors with so many other employment areas open to them.

The average yearly turnover rate of school counselors is about 10 percent. However, 5 percent is attributed to death and retirement. A goodly percentage of the remainder results from promotion of counselors to supervisory or administrative positions. The U. S. Office of Education reports that the turnover rate among counselors is higher than among teachers. Counselors are more frequently promoted to administrative jobs than teachers. School counselors are not tending to leave the field in great numbers. Primary reasons may be found in salary scales, and advancement opportunities within the field. It is interesting to note moreover that school systems with favorable salary levels, in-service training, working conditions, supervision, etc. for school counselors find that many qualified applicants apply for each job opening.

Supervision. There are a wide variety of supervisory practices carried on in school settings. There does, however, appear to be an emphasis on the better use of school resources by the counselor. The Department Head or Chairman of Guidance in a school usually has functional administrative responsibility for supervision in relation to the counseling staff. The school principal may or may not provide professional supervision, depending upon his own educational background. The school principal, however, has a key role in the total development of guidance programs for his school. His decisions as to the use of school resources and resource personnel are critical. The Vice-Principal may coordinate guidance activities from an administrative point of view. Many school systems have supervisors of guidance at the county level.

County and other supervisors are often able to help teachers to see more clearly their role in reenforcing what the counselor may have initiated.

A few common techniques used in supervision are as follows: Tape recording of cases and discussion afterwards, use of one-way screens, discussion of the contents of a case record pulled out of the files at random, sitting in on an interview of client with supervisor and counselor, and other types of learning situations.

Some school systems schedule seminars from time to time for new counselors. New counselors have an opportunity to discuss counseling problems and from these sessions greater competency may be developed. Other school systems schedule from one to four or more meetings a year for all counselors dealing with professional matters. Some school systems have a week or less of in-service, summer workshops for guidance counselors. School counseling and its accompanying supervision is assuming an ever more important role in the school setting.

Salaries. According to the U. S. Office of Education, the average annual salary of most school counselors is approximately $7,500 (for the 1964-65 school year) (61). This average is higher than that being paid to either State employment service counselors or State vocational rehabilitation counselors. See Appendix C for a comparison of salaries for employment counselors and rehabilitation counselors. In some school systems there is a salary differential for the counselor in comparison with teaching staff. Maximum salaries also tend to be higher than for teachers. Salaries are often related to geographical locale and the size of the school enrollment. In 1962-63, the median salaries of school counselors in school systems with enrollments of 100,000 or more ranged from $5,875 (Memphis, Tennessee) to $10,691 (Los Angeles, California).

It should be noted that in most cases these salaries cover a 10-month period rather than a full year. This may leave school counselors free to supplement their incomes by consulting or performing other work for private or public counseling centers, government agencies or private industry. Those with superior qualifications may have rewarding professional and financial opportunities for summer employment.

In the summer of 1964, five high school counselors were hired as a pilot project in the Minnesota State Employment Offices in Duluth and the Twin Cities. These school counselors received a three-day orientation. It was felt that the counselors needed no training in counseling. They received information on the forms, tools, techniques, and operations of the employment service office. They also worked for seven days in operations other than counseling such as intake interviewing, taking employer orders, testing, and placement. This plan differed from the four to five weeks of in-service training counselors in the employment service usually receive prior to assignment of counseling duties. This plan, with various variations, has also been tried out in other States with apparently favorable results.

School counselors have a number of advancement opportunities available to them within the field. One such opportunity is in State Departments of Education.

Since the NDEA in 1958, the members of professional guidance staffs in State educational agencies have grown in number from 99 to 257. This is an increase of more than 140 percent. These workers serve the agencies through which NDEA funds are distributed to local schools. They play a large part in shaping the guidance and counseling programs of these schools. The median salary of these State guidance workers for 1962-63 was $8,603. Some salaries, however, were as high as $12,000. These higher salaries reflect higher average amounts of training and experience. In 1962, of the 178 State guidance workers surveyed, 78 percent had graduate degrees with majors in guidance services. Twenty-three percent had doctoral degrees. All of them had years of experience in education (7). For those counselors with a Ph.D. degree, another avenue for advancement may be college teaching in the guidance field on a full-time or part-time basis.

In general, school counselors are not being attracted to employment in other areas of counseling where both salary scales and opportunities for advancement are less competitive.

Although retention of school counseling personnel does not present a major problem at this time, selection and appropriate training are major issues. While training requirements are rising, some confusion is still present regarding "training for what." Aside from shortages, a problem faced by school counselors is definition of their roles, purpose and areas of responsibility. The term "guidance" or "counseling" mean many things to different people -- education, teaching, a specific specialization, etc. An examination of the literature reveals the application of the terms, "guidance," "counselor," and "counseling," to a wide assortment of somewhat unrelated school activities. It is used in reference to testing, attendance, pupil accounting services, in-service education for staff, conducting field trips, home visitations, assembly programs, homeroom, etc. Effective communication within the field of school counseling as well as between other specialties in counseling must also hurdle these semantic barriers (9).

In 1953 a nation-wide survey by W. L. Hitchcock of 1,300 secondary school counselors revealed a startling lack of agreement regarding the duties counselors were performing and what they believed they should not be doing. This lack of agreement was judged to be one of the major handicaps confronting administrators and counselor-trainees (1). To quote from the results of the survey:

> Of 986 counselors who now assist people with course planning - 41 percent do not feel it is their job.
>
> Of 1,154 counselors who now assist pupils with course planning - 40 percent do not feel it is their job.
>
> Of 1,152 counselors who now assist pupils with occupational plans - 40 percent do not feel it is their job.
>
> Of 893 counselors who now interpret test results to teachers - 33 percent do not feel it is their job.

According to Dr. T. J. Cote of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U. S. Office of Education, studies of counselor problems have indicated vocational counseling as the area in which counselors have most difficulty. He suggests that much is yet to be done in counselor-training institutions to prepare counselors more adequately for vocational guidance functions. Results of the 1960 Project Talent Study, based on a national sample of school counselors, indicate that vocational counseling is regularly available in only 5 out of 10 high schools whereas education counseling for college entrance is available in over 8 out of 10 (25).

In 1963 over half of our high school graduates went on to institutions of higher learning. Between 5 and 6 out of 10 of these students who enter college fail to complete it. They may eventually find their occupational niche at a more realistic subprofessional level. A college dropout rate of approximately 60 percent underscores the need for more thorough and realistic career planning while the student is in high school. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 takes account of this factor. There is the realization that students who do not intend to go on to college education may be in even more acute need of guidance than those who do plan to continue their professional education. The Vocational Education Act requires that these vocational guidance services be made available to all individuals who would benefit from such counseling. Each State must initiate such a program and provide supervision at the local level (52).

Amendments in late 1964 to the National Defense Education Act emphasize vocational counseling as a recognized purpose of this program. Close working relationships within the organization of State departments of education may help to clarify and improve goals and content of training programs for school counselors.

Higher Education - Colleges and Universities

Another area of counseling that has exhibited steady growth during the past few years is that of career counseling and job placement at the college level. At present, there are approximately 2,000 men and women involved in these activities at 4-year, degree granting, accredited colleges throughout the country (6).

Fifteen years ago, the people working in college placement offices were concerned mainly with job placement activities. Their formal training and experience were often in the field of business. Since then there has been a growing recognition of the central role of long-range career planning for the successful job placement of college students. Many college placement personnel believe that there can be no professional job placement without career counseling. This change in emphasis is being reflected in the type of training and experience of these personnel. More of these personnel possess backgrounds in counseling and some have the Ph.D. degree.

The group as a whole has been moving toward greater professionalization. At a number of colleges, the title of College Placement Office has been changed to the Office of Graduate and Career Planning.

The College Placement Council located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, is the Association representing these college placement counselors (11). It is divided into 8 regional associations in various parts of the United States and Canada. Its membership includes representatives from both colleges, universities, and industry. In recent years the relationship between colleges and industry has become much closer. A number of industrial concerns have appointed a Director of College Relations who works closely with the College Placement Director at various colleges. In the regional associations, a certain ratio of university to industrial personnel is maintained.

With the current and anticipated expansion of the college population, an expansion in the field of college counseling and placement is also expected. There will probably be a need for many more personnel in the future. While there are no precise training or selection requirements at present, it appears that the qualifications of persons for this type of work will be similar to those demanded by other groups of counselors.

In 1962-63 the median salary for placement officer directors was $8,000, with a range of $5,200 to $16,520. According to the National Education Association, salaries for placement directors have increased 21 percent since 1957-58. One-third of all placement offices have a professional-level assistant or assistants. Their average annual salary for 1962-63 was $5,300 (6).

The typical placement office has one employee for each 200 graduating students. For each professional-level staff member, the typical office has 1.4 clerical and secretarial employees. Efforts are made to ensure generally favorable working conditions and adequate facilities for private interviewing. Lack of physical space is a major problem in many placement offices, especially during peak-season interviews. At these times, many offices rely on multiple-use space outside of the placement office.

In addition to regular duties, college placement counselors are becoming involved in a number of other important projects. For example, the College Placement Council recently received a grant from the Ford Foundation to communicate with Negro colleges and help them in setting up their own placement offices. A research library is also established at the College Placement Council headquarters. The Council recently completed the filming of a sound movie in color describing college placement services. It is entitled, "Where Do I Go From Here?", narrated by Chet Huntley, and is about 25 minutes in length.

A number of other professional groups are providing counseling services for college students. For women students, counseling at the higher education level is being provided today by more than 2,000 women personnel and guidance workers who belong to the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. This organization was founded in 1916, and has been a department of the National Education Association since 1918. In addition to the actual counseling service they provide, this group is engaged in research activities. Professional growth is evidenced by the contents of their professional journal - the Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.

A somewhat comparable counseling service for men students at the higher education level is provided by Deans of Men at various universities who helped to form the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Both associations have placement committees that assist colleges and universities to find qualified candidates for vacancies and those wishing to find employment opportunities. Much of this service takes place at their annual conventions. Membership was limited to institutions until this year when the rule was changed so that individuals could join as affiliate members. Membership, however, is still by institution. The total membership is about 1,000 of which 500 are member institutions.

A number of deans who belong to this association review the budget for counseling services attached to colleges and universities. The job duties of this group cover a wide range of activities with an emphasis on administrative responsibilities. This group appears to be moving in the direction of greater professional growth and development. They are now publishing a professional journal entitled, "NASPA - the Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs."

Detailed information on salaries, methods of selection, supervision, working conditions, etc., for these two groups was not available to the author for inclusion in this paper.

U. S. ARMED FORCES

Various branches of the Armed Forces constitute another employment setting where educational specialists are being utilized. Counseling is one of the elements included in their duties. Both the U. S. Army and the U. S. Air Force have ongoing programs for guidance and counseling. The U. S. Navy, on the other hand, has no comparable program at present.

U. S. Army

In the Department of the Army, counseling services are a part of the general educational program. The Army hires civilian educational specialists who perform the administrative functions in the various Army schools throughout the country and overseas. Their function is in many ways similar to that of a school principal - supervising teachers and administering various educational programs. However, many of these personnel spend part of their time doing counseling with students at the school. While this is not a full-time function, ability to do counseling is a prime requisite for obtaining employment in this capacity.

There are approximately 300 Educational Specialists working for the U. S. Army. Minimum entrance requirements are a bachelor's degree, including 18 hours of education. Entrance requirements and salary schedules are based on the Federal Civil Service Classification System. Trainees with a college degree and no experience are usually hired at the GS-7 level. Advancement is possible up to GS-15. The related salary levels are $6,050 up to $16,460. Supervision is provided by the Education Director at each Army Center. Some supervision is also available through periodic visits from directors at higher levels within the Department of the Army. There is no anticipated increase in the number of these personnel unless the Army itself increases in size. The main problems of recruitment are related to overseas assignments of personnel, (e.g., to Korea, Okinawa, etc.). There also tends to be a shortage of younger applicants at the trainee level who are recent college graduates. Many of the present personnel are considerably older and approaching retirement age.

U. S. Air Force

Counseling services in the U. S. Air Force are generally organized in similar fashion to those of the U. S. Army. Civilian Air Force Education Services Officers are hired to supervise and administer the educational programs conducted at the various bases. These personnel provide counseling services on a part-time basis as part of their duties. They too are hired as educational specialists based on the Federal Civil Service Classification.

As of December 1964, there were 172 full-time civilian Education Services Officers, plus 10 military officers performing the same functions. Military officers are used in those areas where there is no allowance for civilian personnel. Civilian personnel are generally hired at the GS-9 level (minimum). However, advancement is possible up to GS-12. Minimum entrance requirements include a B. A. degree with any major, plus at least 18 semester hours of education.

These educational specialists receive a minimal amount of direct supervision at the individual Air Force base. Professional direction usually comes from Air Force Headquarters, Education Section.

At present, there are no serious recruitment or selection problems. No increases in the number of staff are anticipated unless there are major increases in the size of the U. S. Air Force. At times, problems may be encountered in attempting to replace persons with a great deal of experience, e.g., at the GS-12 level who may be responsible for programs at the larger bases.

SUMMARY OF SELECTED FACTS

Prior to discussion of some of the issues gleaned from the foregoing presentation, it may be helpful to briefly review and summarize some pertinent facts related to salaries and selection standards. These data are presented in Tables III and IV.

Working Conditions, Supervision and Mobility

There is some form of formal or organized supervision associated with each group of counselors that has been discussed. The amount, form, and intensity of this supervision is highly variable. It tends to differ from agency to agency and from State to State. In many instances, supervision is tied in with various in-service training techniques. The purpose is to increase the professional status and competence of the counselor.

Wide variations are also present in working conditions. The nature of

TABLE III

ANNUAL SALARIES FOR VARIOUS COUNSELING GROUPS

GROUP	AVERAGE	RANGE
1. State Employment Service Counselors	$6,095	$3,819 - $ 9,550
2. Job Corps Counselors		
a. Counselors in Conservation Centers	GS-9 - 11	7,220 - 11,305*
b. Counselors in Urban Training Centers for Men	Variable	Dependent upon individual contractual relationship
c. Counselors in Urban Training Centers for Women	Variable	Same as above
3. Counselors in Private and Community Agencies	7,000	5,500 - 11,000
Supervisors and Directors	12,500	9,000 - 20,000*
4. Rehabilitation Counselors in State and Private Agencies	6,530	3,960 - 9,060
5. Counseling Psychologists in Veterans Administration	GS-11 - 12 and 13	8,650 - 16,460
6. School Counselors in Secondary Schools	7,500	5,875 - 10,691
Counselors in State Departments of Education	8,603	Up to 12,000
7. College Placement Counselors	8,000	5,200 - 16,520

*Very few at this level.

TABLE IV

SELECTION STANDARDS FOR VARIOUS COUNSELING GROUPS

GROUP	TRAINING	EXPERIENCE
1. State Employment Service Counselors*	ACTUAL: BA with course credits in social sciences and counseling	Preferable - sometimes substituted for some educational requirements
	DESIRED: MA in Guidance or at least 30 hours of graduate study in counseling related courses	Preferable
2. Job Corps Counselors		
a. Counselors in Conservation Centers	GS-9 - MA GS-11 - MA	3 years as Counselor 4 years as Counselor
b. Counselors in Urban Training Centers for Men	Variable - dependent upon individual contractors	Variable
c. Counselors in Urban Training Centers for Women	MA or highest level of training available**	Preferable
3. Counselors in Private and Community Agencies	ACTUAL: BA or MA in social sciences	Necessary Preferable
	DESIRED: MA or Ph.D. in counseling	Preferable
4. Rehabilitation Counselors* in State and Private Agencies	ACTUAL: BA or MA in counseling or related field	Preferable
	DESIRED: At least MA - preferably from VRA-sponsored graduate training program	Preferable
5. Counseling Psychologists in Veterans Administration	Ph.D. in psychology or closely related field or 60 graduate hours in counseling & psychology	Necessary - must be in the field of counseling in a medical setting
6. School Counselors in Secondary schools	Teaching certificate plus some graduate level work in the guidance field - often an MA or 30 graduate hours - variations in amount of training related to each State's certification requirements	Necessary - 1 to 5 years teaching experience - In some States 1 year of work experience outside the teaching field

TABLE IV (continued)

GROUP	TRAINING	EXPERIENCE
7. College Placement Counselors	MA in counseling, education or related fields	Preferable

*In most State agencies employees are also required to comply with State Civil Service and Merit System regulations.

**Standards for selection are set by each contractor in line with recommendations from Job Corps Centers for Women.

working conditions is often related most to the size and location of the agency. Conditions also vary according to the particular counseling group. The most common problems associated with working conditions concern lack of sufficient time, limitations on amount of staff, inadequate physical facilities, such as private office space for interviewing, and demands on the counselor for many non-professional types of duties - clerical tasks, etc.

There is an indication that the degree of staff turnover is related to the quality of working conditions as well as salary scales. In general, there is greater turnover among counselors in settings characterized by lower salary scales and less adequate working conditions than in settings where conditions are more favorable professionally. There tends to be a smaller amount of turnover within an employment setting where wider salary ranges exist, and there are more opportunities for advancement.

OVERVIEW

The emerging profession of counseling is growing rapidly in an attempt to meet the increasing guidance needs of a changing technological and urban society. It appears that we are moving from an emphasis on techniques to a profession with substance, process, purposeful goals, and meaningful standards of competence and responsibility. We are moving away from "how to do" to "what can and ought to be done" and to "why it is useful and important." This growth is evident not only in established settings such as in private vocational counseling agencies and in the schools, but also in many new employment settings.

Vocational consultants are now being used extensively in a quasi-judicial status by the Bureau of Appeals and Examiners of the Social Security Administration as expert witnesses. Some professional workers in private practice are devoting a major portion of their time to this endeavor. More than 250 of these vocational consultants are needed now, with accelerating demand for many more during the next 5 years (35). The War on Poverty is also creating hundreds of new counseling and consulting positions. Regardless of the employment setting, employers are seeking personnel with basically similar counseling training and skills.

A new type of community organization is now being formed in various parts of the United States. The United Planning Organization, or organizations with comparable names in different communities who are community action agencies, are now searching for counseling personnel. Community action agencies, for example, receive funds from the Office of Manpower Administration of the U. S. Department of Labor in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Counselors will be based in neighborhood development centers. These offices will be established primarily at neighborhood settlement houses. The stance is centralization of services through neighborhood youth centers. Counselors will be interested primarily in helping clients in the area of training and obtaining jobs. They will open neighborhood employment network systems. It is planned so that disadvantaged people will have adequate and accurate information and be better able to obtain suitable openings.

The United States Employment Service will have counselors detached from their offices to work closely with counselors hired through the United Planning Organization. Psychological testing and other professional counseling work will be a joint effort of staff from the United States Employment Service and the United Planning Organization. Some of the people trained through Project CAUSE will serve as subprofessional members of the counseling team.

United Planning Organization counselors will be hired at the following comparable GS ratings and qualifications although the positions are not Civil Service appointments: Chief Counselor, GS-10; Senior Counselor, GS-9; Intermediate Counselor, GS-8; Junior Counselor, GS-7; Field Supervisor, GS-8; Crew Chief, GS-6; and, Resident Worker (Neighborhood), $4,000 to $5,000. The range of counseling staff hired is to be from GS-6 to GS-10 level.

Counselors at the Senior and Chief Counselor level will have at least a master's degree with relevant experience. Qualifications for hiring personnel below this level will be based particularly on their having worked with or possessing a knowledge in depth of the disadvantaged.

A conservative estimate is that there will be at least 2,000 counselors at various levels hired during the coming year throughout the United States. These counselors will work for community action non-profit agencies supported largely by government funds. These agencies will have a community governing board of directors who set policy. They will represent a cross-section of knowledgeable community people in the area in which they operate. New programs of this sort make for even greater shortages of counseling personnel at every level.

Shortages of "qualified" personnel exist at present in almost every area of counseling. Greater shortages are anticipated in the future. The word "qualified" has been placed in quotes because this word and the semantic and functional complexities of counseling seem to be at the heart of some "touchy and knotty" problems. Shortages of personnel refer not so much to absolute numbers of people per se, but to people operating at a certain level or type of training or experience, or both.

There seems to be no general agreement among counseling specialties or among the States as to what levels or types of training or experience should be required. Each counseling specialty tends to have its own selection standards and training requirements.

The main area of agreement among all the counseling specialties appears to be that adequate and qualified personnel are essential in the administration of any counseling program. Counselors, in order to be qualified, should be receiving more and better training. As the counseling profession strives for further professional recognition and status, training requirements for each specialty continually increase. The counseling specialties appear to acknowledge the need for some sort of common core of basic knowledge, value system, psychological understanding, etc., for the qualified counselor. Communication between the various specialties is increasing. Indications are, however, that much more communication and basic understanding is needed at the local, State, and national level.

Project CAUSE, which was described earlier, demonstrated the existence of a large supply of potential job candidates, particularly among recent college graduates who are interested in counseling. It appears they may be trained to perform some of the counselor's duties satisfactorily at subprofessional levels. Much more research seems indicated as to their role, purpose, status, and potential functions and qualifications. Until recently, this source of potential personnel has remained virtually untapped.

As entrance standards rise, so do demands for higher salary scales to match the higher training levels of the counselors. When these demands for salary increases are not adequately met, the result is usually higher turnover among the most competent staff members. At present, employers of counselors in some settings are obliged to hire counseling personnel at lower levels than desired.

Higher selection and training requirements result also in increased demands for qualified counselor educators in institutions of higher education. Differences of opinion exist as to what should be taught and what should be the emphasis in a specific curriculum. With greater communication between various specialties and interdisciplinary study, counseling curricula might well become more appropriate.

Content from related disciplines is being introduced into the curriculum at many schools. This is often based on the staff's careful thinking through the principles that underlie adaptation of content from another subject field. There also seem to be some indication of improved methods of interdisciplinary communication on the part of faculty and students. In a few cases the counseling curriculum is starting to reflect earlier introduction of the practicum in a particular setting. Students then have an opportunity to apply theory with adequate supervision at an earlier stage in their development. There is also a growth toward higher standards for field instruction of students in the various counseling specialties.

A giant step forward in the direction of interdisciplinary communication was the development in 1961 of the Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services with a five-year grant of $1.3 million from the National Institutes of Health. Fifteen associations eventually participated. These associations are concerned, directly or indirectly, with pupil personnel work and mental health in the school setting. In 1963, four research centers were established. Headquarters of the Central Staff is at the University of Maryland. The Central Staff anticipates making a national survey of pupil personnel services, establishing criteria for evaluation of these services, etc.

Funds specifically designated for advanced training are available for school counselors under the National Defense Education Act and for rehabilitation counselors from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Current financial appropriations have been judged by vocational experts to be inadequate to handle training needs. "If the Federal Government were to provide for the incentive support of guidance, counseling, and testing on the basis of the same amount for each full-time equivalent counselor in 1969-70 as in 1958-59, the amount of Federal funds required would need to be increased more than four times" (12).

The variation among different groups of counselors constitutes a number of problems for the entire counseling profession. Each counseling specialty has its own unique salary scale, selection, and training requirements, and training programs. This seems to result in a semblance of competition rather than cooperation. As each group drives toward professionalization and personal identity, there seems to be proliferation of counseling activities rather than full professional cooperation.

Recent legislation may almost force counseling specialties into a closer and more cooperative relationship. One of the fundamental provisions of the 1963 Vocational Education Act is that there ought to be cooperative agreements between vocational and educational agencies and public employment service agencies. This may insure that consideration is given to available labor market data and that there will be effective coordination of the counseling services offered by schools and employment services (4). Closer working relationships require that there be more effective communication between various groups. Communication between counselors from different settings might be enhanced if there were greater comparability as to levels of training, average salary scales, professional status, methods of selection, working conditions, and mutual exchange of counseling information, research, and positions at various times. One indication of increasing cooperation is the fact that APGA, ACES, and ASCA have arrived at consensus in some aspects of their policy statements.

There are no easy answers in the emerging counseling profession. As some answers are found, they only lead to further complex questions. Counselors, no matter what their employing setting, are instruments of change. New research, new knowledge, new concepts can be built upon the past experience of the profession.

APPENDIX A

An Analysis of Candidates for Employment. Listed in Placement Service Bulletin (1963-64 Volume) of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Throws light on geographic mobility of counseling personnel and other personnel matters relating to salary, age, etc.

ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATES FOR EMPLOYMENT*

	Men	Percent	Women	Percent	Total	Percent
Total Number of Candidates	396	75%	133	25%	529	100%
Desired Employment						
College and University Level	235	59%	84	63%	319	60%
Secondary & Elementary Level	141	36%	42	32%	183	35%
Rehabilitation	12	3%	2	1%	14	3%
Other	8	2%	5	4%	13	2%
Present Employment						
College & University Level	128	33%	50	38%	178	34%
Secondary & Elementary Level	196	50%	62	47%	258	49%
Rehabilitation	13	3%	1	---	14	3%
Student	30	7%	13	10%	43	8%
Other	29	7%	7	5%	36	6%
Degrees Obtained (highest)						
Doctoral	85	21%	11	8%	96	18%
Masters	291	74%	119	90%	410	78%
Less than Masters	20	5%	3	2%	23	4%
Minimum Salary Requested						
Under $5,000	1	---	1	---	2	----
$5,000 - $6,000	10	3%	8	6%	18	3%
$6,000 - $7,000	49	12%	24	19%	73	14%
$7,000 - $8,000	63	16%	25	19%	88	17%
$8,000 - $9,000	54	14%	17	13%	71	14%
$9,000 - $10,000	36	9%	4	3%	40	8%
$10,000 or over	37	9%	2	1%	39	7%
Not Stated on Resume Form	146	37%	52	39%	198	37%
Preferred Geographic Region						
Northeast	78	20%	42	32%	120	22%
Southeast	19	5%	12	9%	31	6%
Southwest	69	17%	22	17%	91	17%
Midwest	54	14%	18	13%	72	14%
Northwest	13	3%	1	---	14	3%
No Preference	163	41%	38	29%	201	38%
Age Range						
20 - 29	116	30%	47	35%	163	31%
30 - 39	199	50%	37	28%	236	45%
40 - 49	60	15%	30	23%	90	17%
50 - 59	17	4%	15	11%	32	6%
60 or Over	4	1%	4	3%	8	1%
Years in Guidance Field						
Under 5	229	58%	79	59%	308	58%
5 - 10	122	31%	38	29%	160	31%
10 - 15	30	7%	9	7%	39	7%
Over 15	15	4%	7	5%	22	4%

ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATES FOR EMPLOYMENT* (continued)

	Men	Percent	Women	Percent	Total	Percent
Employment now at Secondary or Elementary Level but indicate desire to move into college or university level	76	19%	21	16%	97	18%
Candidates who have notified us they have accepted employment (by August 1, 1964)	54	14%	28	21%	82	15%

*Listed in Placement Service Bulletin (1963-64 Volume).

APPENDIX B

A brief analysis of job vacancies in the Placement Service Bulletin of the American Personnel and Guidance Association follows.

In 1963-64, almost two-thirds of the job vacancies listed in the Placement Service Bulletin indicated a master's degree as the preferred requirement. Almost half of the job vacancies were at the college level. Jobs at the college level were in the settings of counseling, psychology, teaching, student personnel, and residence halls. The preponderance of job vacancies existed in the northeast and midwest.

ANALYSIS OF JOB VACANCIES LISTED IN PLACEMENT SERVICE BULLETIN (1963-64 Volume)

	College & University				High Sch & Elem		Non-Sch	Rehab/Voc	
	Couns/Psych	Tchg	Stu Pers	Res Hl	Couns/Guid	Psych	Psych	Couns	Misc
Pref Degree									
Doctorate	45	26	21	1	4	6	20	2	6
Masters	18	1	43	59	77	28	7	51	18
Less than Masters			10	5	13			3	7
Pref Yrs of Exper									
5 or more	2	1	5	1	12		4	2	5
1 - 3	9	1	7	3	33	15	16	20	8
No. not specified	43	23	51	48	30	10	5	25	13
None required	9	2	11	13	19	9	2	9	5
Sex									
Man	13	8	25	25	14	2	4	8	11
Woman	9		27	32	31			1	1
Either	41	19	22	8	49	32	23	47	19
Starting Salary				(+ main)					
Under $5,000			2	19	4				1
$5,000 - $6,000	6		5	13	34	5	1	19	5
$6,000 - $7,000	6	2	14	13	11	14	1	7	5
$7,000 - $8,000	13	12	18		10	2	6	10	5
$8,000 - $9,000	13	1	4		4	2	9	7	5
$9,000 - $10,000	6	2	3		4	1	1		2
$10,000 or over	1		4		1		5	2	5
Not stated	18	10	24	18	26	10	4	11	3
Location									
Northeast	22	9	35	18	52	13	17	23	13
Southeast	9	2	3	5	6	6	3	6	5
Southwest	4	7	4	7	7	1	1	1	4
Midwest	23	7	30	35	22	14	6	18	9
Northwest	3	1	2		6			6	
Foreign	2	1			1			2	

Grad Stu Programs	Level		Type		Exper		Sex		Salary	Location	
	Toward Doctorate	-	Res Hall	5	Amt not specif	6	Man	2	Varies	N E	5
	Toward Masters	2	Rehab Intern	2	None required	2	Woman	1		S W	1
	Either	6	Testing Ass't	1			Either	5		N W	2

APPENDIX C

The following comparison of State salaries for employment counselors and vocational rehabilitation counselors indicates differences in minimum and maximum salaries being paid to these two groups in each State as of January 1, 1965.

COMPARISON OF STATE SALARIES FOR EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR AND FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELOR

	United States	Higher Range for Employment Counselors	Same Pay Range Both Classes	Pay Range for Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors	Lower Range for Employment Counselors
I	Connecticut			7080-9280	5040-6880
	Maine		4680-5668	4680-5668	
	Massachusetts			6505-8190	5135-6507
	New Hampshire			*5457-6577	4533-5413
	Rhode Island		*5031-6357	5031-6357	
	Vermont		4680-6032	4680-6032	
II	New Jersey	5774-7508		5499-7149	
	New York			*7320-8875	*6180-7535
	Puerto Rico	4260-5220		3960-4860	
	Virgin Islands				
III	Delaware			5400-6940	4980-6300
	Dist. of Col.				
	Maryland		*5970-7464	5970-7464	
	North Carolina			*5484-6960	5220-6636
	Pennsylvania			5803-7055	*5529-6716
	Virginia			*5880-7680	4920-6432
	West Virginia	*5220-6840		4920-6480	
IV	Alabama			6000-7500	*4800-6000
	Florida			*6000-6300	4560-5760
	Georgia			6372-8976	5784-7380
	Mississippi			6490-7150	5220-6420
	South Carolina			5600-8000	4980-6505
	Tennessee			6000-7440	5640-7080
V	Kentucky		4740-5760	4740-5760	
	Michigan			6160-7579	6034-6222
	Ohio			*5520-6600	4560-5520
VI	Illinois	*6000-8340		*5640-6900	
	Indiana	5400-7500		5280-6600	
	Minnesota	5616-6828		5400-6564	
	Wisconsin			6588-8568	6108-7968
VII	Iowa			6600-8700	5340-6060
	Kansas			4980-6360	4740-6060
	Missouri			6600-7600	4224-5640
	Nebraska			6300-7200	5040-6480
	North Dakota	5460-7140		5000-6000	
	South Dakota			*6000-7200	5400-6900
VIII	Arkansas			5940-6900	5280-6480
	Louisiana		5280-6480	5280-6480	
	Oklahoma		5280-6600	5280-6600	
	Texas			6624-8076	5436-6624

COMPARISON OF STATE SALARIES FOR EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR AND FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELOR (continued)

	United States	Higher Range for Employment Counselors	Same Pay Range Both Classes	Pay Range for Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors	Lower Range for Employment Counselors
IX	Colorado	6204-7920		5904-7536	
	Montana			5700-7500	*5640-7080
	New Mexico			5520-7560	*5040-6900
	Utah			6216-8700	5382-7176
	Wyoming			7200-9000	*6360-7560
X	Arizona	*5880-7152		5400-6300	
	California			7800-9480	6120-7428
	Guam				
	Hawaii	6156-7860		5868-7488	
	Nevada			6432-7764	*6132-7404
XI	Alaska		7560-9060	7560-9060	
	Idaho			* 7320	5796-7044
	Oregon			*6000-7500	*5760-7200
	Washington			6324-7524	*5796-6900

*Change from previous rate on 7/1/64. HEW-DSMS Survey.

4

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, J. F., Counseling and Guidance, A Summary View, Theory and Practice. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965, 386 pp.

2. American Board on Counseling Services, Inc., Criteria for Approval of Certain Counseling Services, Adopted March, 1962. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962, 4 pp.

3. American Science Manpower, 1962, A Report of the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel, National Science Foundation. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, NSF 64-16, 1964, 155 pp.

4. Arnold, W. M., "New Directions in Vocational Education," a Reprint from American Vocational Journal. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, October 1964, 6 pp.

5. Bokelman, W. R. and D'Amico, L. A., Higher Education, SALARIES, 1962-63. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-53015-63, Circular 712, 1964, 70 pp.

6. Calvert, R. Jr. and Menke, R. F., "1963 Salaries - Budgets - Physical Facilities," Journal of College Placement. April 1963, pp. 26-110.

7. Camp, D., "The GUIDANCE WORKER in the State Department of Education," a Reprint from SCHOOL LIFE. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-25041, July, 1964, 9 pp.

8. Camp, D., Guidance Workers Certification Requirements. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-25005A Bulletin 1960. No. 14 (Rev.), 1963, 107 pp.

9. Casile, B. A., "A Perplexing Predicament--Jargon in Guidance." National Catholic Guidance Conference Journal, Spring 1965, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 171-176.

10. College Placement Annual 1965. Bethlehem, Penna.: The College Placement Council, Inc., Issued annually, 504 pp.

11. The College Placement Council, Services and Publications. Bethlehem, Penna.: The College Placement Council, Inc., Undated, 15 pp.

12. Commitment to Youth. A Report on 5 Years of Progress in Guidance, Counseling, and Testing Under Title V of the National Defense Education Act, 1958-59/1962-63. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-25039, 1964, 44 pp.

13. Comparison of State Salaries for Employment Counselor and for Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor HEW-DSMS Survey 7/1/64. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, 1964, 1 p.

14. Comparison of State Salaries for Employment Counselor and for Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor HEW-DSMS Survey 1/1/65. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, 1965, 2 pp.

15. *Counseling News & Views, Division 17, Counseling Psychology*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, March 1965, Vol. 17, No. 1, 8 pp.

16. *Counselor Education--A Progress Report on Standards, Discussion, Reaction, and Related Papers, APGA National Convention*. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, April 1962, 90 pp.

17. *The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role, A Statement of Policy*. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1964, 6 pp.

18. Craig, W. G., "The Student Personnel Profession: An Instrument of National Goals," *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, June 1962, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 162-168 & 184.

19. *1965-1966 Directory of Approved Counseling Agencies*, Washington, D. C.: American Board on Counseling Services, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965, 177 pp.

20. *Directory of State Department of Education Personnel for Guidance, Counseling, and Testing*, Compiled by The Guidance Program Development Section, Guidance and Counseling Programs Branch, Frank L. Sievers, Director. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, September 1964, OE-25037-A, 22 pp.

21. Dishart, M., *A National Study of 84,699 Applicants For Services From State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964, 92 pp.

22. Dishart, M. and Epstein, M., *Patterns of Rehabilitation Services Provided By the 90 State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies of the United States*. Washington, D. C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964, 146 pp.

23. Dorman, E. S. (Editor), *Employment Service Review*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Employment Service, December 1964, Vol. 1, No. 12, 78 pp.

24. Dorman, E. S. (Editor), *Employment Service Review, Manpower Around the World*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Employment Service, March 1965, 74 pp.

25. Flanagan, J. C., Dailey, J. T., Shaycoft, D. B., and Goldberg, I., *Project Talent, A Survey and Follow-up Study of Educational Plans and Decisions in Relation to Aptitude Patterns: Studies of the American High School, Cooperative Research Project No. 226*. Pittsburgh, Penna.: Project Talent Office, University of Pennsylvania, 1962, 11 Chapters.

26. Foley, W. J. and Proff, F. C., "NDEA Institute Trainees and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors: A Comparison of Characteristics," *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Spring 1965, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 154-159.

27. Fredrickson, R. H. and Pippert, R. R., "Teaching Experience in the Employment of School Counselors," *Counselor Education and Supervision*. Fall 1964, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 24-27.

28. Gordon, J. E., "The Concern for Cause," *Counselor Education and Supervision*. Spring 1965, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 131-141.

29. Gottlieb, D., The First Thirty, Get Paid While You Work, Learn, Travel, Step Up to Job Corps. Washington, D. C.: Program Development and Analysis Division, Job Corps, January 1965, Corpsman Report #1, 7 pp.

30. Graduates of Rehabilitation Counselor Training Programs: Their Employment Status in April 1962. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Division of Training, 1962, 2 pp.

31. Hall, J. H. and Warren, S. L. (Editors), Rehabilitation Counselor Preparation. Washington, D. C.: National Rehabilitation Association and National Vocational Guidance Association, 1956, 78 pp.

32. Harris, A. L., "Manpower for the Space Age: A Total Educational Commitment," Counselor Education and Supervision. Summer 1964, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 181-190.

33. Harrison, E., "Talent Search for Womanpower," AAUW Journal. March 1965. Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 99-101.

34. Hill, G. E., "The Cause 'Debate'-Comments on the Odgers Gordon Articles," Counselor Education and Supervision. Spring 1965, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 142-143.

35. Information Kit for Vocational Consultants Under Contract With The Bureau of Hearings and Appeals. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Hearings and Appeals, January 1965, 7 Sections.

36. Joslin, L. C., Jr., "Knowledge and Counseling Competence," The Personnel and Guidance Journal. April 1965, Vol. XLIII, No. 8, pp. 790-795.

37. Larsen, J. M., Jr. and Owens, W. A., Jr., "Worker Satisfaction as a Criterion," Personnel Psychology, A Journal of Applied Research. Spring 1965, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 39-47.

38. Lindley, C. J., "The American Board on Counseling Services, What counseling services are evaluated? How does the Board function? How can you assist the Board?" a Reprint from Personnel and Guidance Journal. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, September 1963, 6 pp.

39. Litwack, L., "Counselor Educator-Redundancy or Dichotomy?" Counselor Education and Supervision. Fall 1964, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 42-45.

40. Loughary, J. W. (Editor), Stripling, R. O. and Fitzgerald, P. W. (Associate Editors), Counseling, A Growing Profession, Report of American Personnel and Guidance Association Concerned with the Professionalization of Counseling. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965, 106 pp.

41. McCully, C. H., "The Counselor-Instrument of Change," Teachers College Record. February 1965, pp. 405-412.

42. McCully, C. H., "Making a Troika Work," Counselor Education and Supervision. Summer 1964, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 191-201.

43. McCully, C. H., "Regional Concerns and the National Interest in Guidance," Counselor Education and Supervision. Spring 1965, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 115-124.

44. Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training, Transmitted to the Congress March 1965. United States Department of Labor. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1965, 276 pp.

45. Meyering, R. A., "The Wonderland of Counselor Education," Counselor Education and Supervision. Fall 1964, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 37-41.

46. Miller, C. H., Guidance Services, An Introduction. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965, 418 pp.

47. Odgers, J. G., "Cause for Concern," Counselor Education and Supervision. Fall 1964, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 17-20.

48. Patterson, C. H., "Subprofessional Functions and Short-term Training," Counselor Education and Supervision. Spring 1965, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 144-146.

49. Perrone, P. A. and Evans, D. L., "The Elementary School Counselor? Coordinator? Or What?" Counselor Education and Supervision. Fall 1964, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 28-31.

50. "Poverty Programs: Applause, Analysis and Accountability," American Child. March 1965, Vol. 47, No. 2, 24 pp.

51. "A Proposal for Acceptance and Implementation of the Guidelines," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly. Spring 1965, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 221.

52. "Public Law 88-210, 88th Congress, H. R. 4955, December 18, 1963, An Act," Vocational Education Act of 1963. Washington, D. C.: U. S. House of Representatives, 1963, 18 pp.

53. Recommendations of the Work Committee on Counselor Standards and Training, General Administration Letter No. 743, January 7, 1964, and Attachment. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, 1964, 7 pp.

54. The Role and Mission of the Federal-State Employment Service in the American Economy, Report Prepared by the Subcommittee Staff to Select Subcommittee on Labor. Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Eighty-Eighth Congress, Second Session. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965, 99 pp.

55. Rosen, H., "Vocational Education and Manpower Needs," a Reprint from the Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration, Preprint No. 5, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1964, 4 pp.

56. Ross, S. and Lockman, R. F., A Career in Psychology. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1963, 31 pp.

57. Salaries Paid and Salary Practices in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64, Higher Education Series Research Report 1964-R3. Washington, D. C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1964, 59 pp.

58. Salary Schedules for Administrative Personnel, 1964-65, Public School Salaries Series, Research Report 1965-R-2. Washington, D. C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1965, 221 pp.

59. Schantz, L. and McGowan, J. F., "Upgrading Employment Service Counselors in Missouri," *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*. Spring 1965, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 169-175.

60. Simon, K. A. and Fullam, M. G., *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1973-74*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education (1964 Edition), OE-10030, 1964, 42 pp.

61. Simon, K. A. and Grant, W. V., *Digest of Educational Statistics 1964 Edition*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1964, No. 18, OE-10024-64, 1964, 175 pp.

62. Smits, S. J., "Rehabilitation Counseling Manpower Needs, A Summary of the Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study," *NRCA Professional Bulletin*. November 1964, Vol. IV, No. 2, 3 pp.

63. Smits, S. J., *Rehabilitation Counselor Recruitment Study Final Report*, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, 1965, 98 pp.

64. "Standards for Counselor Education in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors, Report of The Committee on Counselor Education Standards in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. June 1964, pp. 1062-1072.

65. *State Salary Ranges - Selected Classes in Employment Security, Public Welfare, Public Health, Mental Health, Vocational Rehabilitation, Civil Defense*. Washington, D. C.: Division of State Merit Systems, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 1964, 49 pp.

66. *State Standards for Guidance and Counseling, Seminar I*. Prepared by the Guidance and Counseling Programs Branch for National Guidance Conference, Providence, Rhode Island, April 4-6, 1963. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1963, 29 pp. 2 attachments.

67. *Statement of Policy for Secondary School Counselors and Guidelines for Implementation of the ASCA Statement of Policy for Secondary Counselors*. Washington, D. C.: American School Counselor Association, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1964, 11 pp.

68. *Studies in Rehabilitation Counselor Training, Experiences of State Agencies in Hiring VRA Trainees, No. 2*, Joint Liaison Committee of the Council of State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Rehabilitation Counselor Educators. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, 1963, 70 pp.

69. *Suggested Guidelines for Further Coordination of Educational Institutions and Employment Services*. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*. Spring 1965, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 215-220.

70. *Summary Reports of Annual Meetings of Rehabilitation Counselor Educators 1957-1962*. Stillwater, Oklahoma: The Clearing House, Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program, Oklahoma State University, 1965, 15 pp.

71. Thompson, A. S. and Super, D. E. (Editors), *The Professional Preparation of Counseling Psychologists, Report of the 1964 Greyston Conference*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, 165 pp.

72. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Written Communications, 1965.

73. *United States Employment Service Program Letter No. 1719 and Attachment, National Survey of Employment Service Counselor Characteristics*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, November 5, 1964, 9 pp.

74. *United States Employment Service Program Letter No. 1738 and Attachment, Results of National Survey of State Counseling Supervisors*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, December 9, 1964, 6 pp.

75. *Veterans Administration, Emergency Interim Issue (EM 22-54) Section III - Vocational Counseling, Training and Adjustment Activity*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Veterans Benefits, Veterans Administration, 1962, pp. 15-32.

76. *The Vocational Education Act of 1963*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-80034, 1965, 29 pp.

77. *Vocational Rehabilitation Administration Training Grant Program, Description of Program and Procedures for Applying For and Administering Grants*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Revised, 1963, 53 pp.

78. *The Vocational Research Program-Follow-Up Studies of Vocational Trainees and High School Students*. Madison, Wisconsin: Research Center for Vocational Education, Industrial Relations Center, The University of Wisconsin, Mimeograph, 1965.

79. *Wanted--More Women in Educational Leadership*. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1965, 28 pp.

80. Wrenn, C. G., *The Counselor in a Changing World*. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962, 195 pp.

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED COUNSELORS

by

Edward C. Roeber, Professor
University of Michigan

Professions are created by a social need. As they respond to this need, they depend upon interpretations and interactions by and among professional workers and lay people. Ideally roles and functions of professional workers are thus attuned to social goals sought, and they are modified as experience indicates how they may be improved. This experience cannot always be reduced to empirical research. In an endeavor to discuss roles and functions of professional workers in different settings, therefore, it is necessary to rely heavily upon samples of statements of professional associations, leaders in the profession, and conference statements designed to clarify issues and develop guidelines.

In the professional literature, roles and functions of a professional counselor have been described in many ways. The terms "role" and "function" have been used interchangeably, or the literature at least has not made clear distinctions between them. Unless a distinction is made between "role" and "function," however, it is difficult to clarify ultimate and immediate roles for counselors in different settings -- also to identify any similarities and differences among functions of counselors in different settings. In order to facilitate communication with respect to the objectives of this paper, a position has been taken with respect to the two terms, i.e., "role" refers to the part taken or assumed by a professional worker, and "function" specifies a way in which a professional worker performs or carries out a role. The former term, "role" includes goal, objective, or purpose for carrying out a role. This distinction may seem unreasonable until one examines various statements which make use of these terms; for example, a statement from an agency states that a counselor "helps the counselee analyze and evaluate his vocational assets, to relate them to possible occupational goals, and to make an appropriate vocational choice." This statement implies vocational choice and adjustment as a role or end sought by counselors in that agency and, at the same time, the statement implies some type of helping relationship as a function or means of attaining this goal. "Function," in this latter case, is not clear because the means to the goal is not explicit in terms of how a counselor performs, although certainly counseling or small-group work would be implicit in the statement. Subsequent sections of this paper recognize this distinction between "role" and "function."

ROLES OF PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED COUNSELORS

Professionally trained counselors work in a variety of settings, viz., educational institutions, employment services, rehabilitation services in agencies or hospitals. Assuming some type of equivalency among professional counselors, whatever their settings for employment, ultimate and immediate roles (goals, objectives, or ends sought) may be somewhat alike; however, there may also be some differences which are unique to each setting. Some authoritative statements about three settings, which serve as prototypes of all settings, highlight similarities and differences.

Roles of Employment Counselors

Although variations may occur in practices of counselors in employment services among the fifty states, the roles of employment counseling* can be described by selecting a series of statements from Part II, Chapter 4000, Employment Services Manual (cited in McGowan and Porter, 5). These statements have been placed in a semblance of order, beginning with the ultimate role, followed by intermediate roles, and finally by immediate roles.

ULTIMATE ROLE	The purpose of employment counseling is to help each applicant achieve vocational adjustment at as satisfactory a social, economic, and skill level as possible.

---

*The Employment Service discusses roles in terms of "counseling" rather than the title of the person who carries out this function.

The field of work or occupation he (an applicant) chooses should utilize the best possible combination of his higher potentialities, together with his interests, temperaments, values, and other pertinent factors.

INTERMEDIATE ROLES

Employment counseling should help a person gain sufficient insight into his own interests and abilities and the nature of the world of work so that he can make his own decisions, not only as to the selection of a vocational goal but as to the steps that should be taken to reach that goal.

- - -

To assist an inexperienced applicant who has not made a satisfactory vocational choice to review and evaluate his present and potential qualifications and relate them to occupational requirements so that he may select an appropriate occupation and develop a realistic vocational plan.

IMMEDIATE ROLES

To assist an experienced applicant who wishes to, or must, change his occupation to explore possible alternative fields of work, choose a more suitable occupation, and develop a plan to help him make the change to appropriate employment.

To assist an applicant who has encountered problems which are hindering him from entering, holding, or progressing in a job in his chosen field, to discover, analyze, and understand his vocational problem and to make the necessary adjustments and plans for resolving it.

- - -

This array of statements rather clearly defines a counselor's role(s) as one of helping clients (of any age, sex, occupational history) to higher levels of vocational adjustment. As rather aptly summarized by McGowan and Porter (5), a counselor in the employment service "is more concerned with the tangible or product aspects of counseling outcome than with reconstructing the emotive or process aspects of a counselee's personality." His immediate task is helping a client become optimally employed as quickly as feasible, relying upon other agency or community resources when employability depends upon fundamental, long-term changes in attitudes, values, needs, and other personality dimensions. As stated earlier, an employment counselor's role(s) is rather clear-cut and unequivocal, a condition that is unique to this group of counselors as contrasted with subsequent groups.

Roles of Rehabilitation Counselors

Rehabilitation services are quite varied, and so the present discussion is confined to two of the more common patterns: the state rehabilitation counselor, and the Veterans Administration counselor who may work in the Department of Medicine and Surgery and in the Department of Veterans Benefits. In spite of variations within a single agency, such as is the case with the Veterans Administration, the following roles have been attributed to the rehabilitation counselor by a joint conference representing the National Rehabilitation Association and the National Vocational Guidance Association (3).

ULTIMATE ROLE	The counselor is responsible for aiding the disabled individual in securing employment consistent with his capacities and preparation.
INTERMEDIATE ROLES	He (the counselor) serves the disabled directly through his skills as a counselor. He is also responsible for securing the best available professional assistant in meeting the needs of his client and to integrate and coordinate these services.
IMMEDIATE ROLES	To evaluate a client's vocational potential as a step essential to identifying significant factors fundamental to the planning of therapeutic programs. To provide assistance in cases where personal or emotional problems are interfering with or impeding progress in rehabilitation. To assist the client in selecting a vocational objective which is suitable in terms of interest, aptitudes, and functional capacities of the disabled veteran and in terms of the physical and emotional demands of the occupation. To arrange for employment consistent with the client's disabilities and capacities. To provide assistance until vocational adjustment seems assured.

From this array of roles, we can see that a rehabilitation counselor, like an employment counselor, is concerned with optimum vocational adjustment of his clients. However, a rehabilitation counselor is constantly working within medical limits, those associated with his client's disabilities as well as those imposed by the nature of different work and educational settings. There are four roles which are more explicitly stated in the case of rehabilitation counselors that are apparent from statements about the roles of employment counselors: (a) rehabilitation counselors are much more active in coordinating all services, medical and community agencies, for their clients; (b) rehabilitation counselors are much more active in arranging for employment of clients; (c) rehabilitation counselors are permitted more freedom in providing assistance until vocational adjustment is or seems assured; and (d) rehabilitation counselors are given more latitude in providing assistance in cases where personal or emotional problems are affecting rehabilitation efforts. The needs of people with disabilities apparently require rehabilitation counselors to coordinate every possible resource and play a more active role in providing long-term, multiple forms of assistance.

Roles of Counselors in Educational Institutions

Counselors for all educational levels have not as yet been described in any detail. Secondary school counselors, particularly those employed in junior and senior high schools, have been the center of attention for several decades - and statements of their roles are in great abundance. However, counselors in elementary schools and junior colleges have only recently become a major focus of public and professional attention;[1] and therefore the focus of these materials is upon roles of secondary school counselors. (A strong case might be made for assuming that roles and functions for counselors at the elementary school and junior college levels may not be fundamentally different from those of secondary school counselors. Such a position is still hypothetical and has not influenced conclusions in this presentation.)

Although the American School Counselor Association has recently published a statement of policy (2) based on its study of counselor role and function (a statement accepted by approximately ninety percent of the association members), it has not removed all controversy from the school counselors' role. This paper uses the ASCA statement as the backdrop for discussion but, at the same time, the professional literature is explored for further clarifications and/or issues connected with the secondary school counselors' roles. On the basis of a series of statements, hopefully not too far removed from their context in the ASCA statement, secondary school counselors' roles can be described in the following ways:

---

[1] Counselors for college and university counseling centers have ordinarily been called "counseling psychologists" (pre-doctoral and doctoral levels) and their roles and functions have been the more clinically oriented functions of all counselors (4, 7). Roles and functions of college and university counselors in student personnel offices other than counseling centers have not as yet been clarified by associations or counselors themselves; nevertheless there are current activities in several associations designed to develop statements of their roles and functions.

ULTIMATE ROLE	A school counselor....is concerned with and accepts a responsibility for assisting all pupils, and has as his major concern the developmental needs and problems of youth.
INTERMEDIATE ROLE	The school counselor is dedicated to the idea that each pupil will enhance and enrich his personal development and self-fulfillment by means of making more intelligent decisions if he is helped to better understand himself, the environment he perceives, and the relationship between these.
IMMEDIATE ROLES	To help each pupil to meet the need to understand and accept himself in relation to the social and psychological world in which he lives. To assist each pupil to meet the need to develop personal decision-making competency. To assist all members of the school staff individually and through the total educational program, parents, and the community, to contribute to each child's development.

A general theme permeates the ASCA statement regarding the ultimate role, i.e., a school counselor is concerned with developmental needs and problems of all pupils. As immediate roles are examined, a school counselor seems to be concerned with helping pupils understand themselves and accept themselves and the world in which they live. In addition the counselor helps pupils develop a sense of responsibility for and a competency in decision-making. Translated freely, these role statements could mean that a counselor is concerned about "doing all things for all people." In a very real sense, a school counselor is expected to have much more broadly conceived roles than those attributed to either an employment counselor or a rehabilitation counselor.

Based upon a rather comprehensive study of school counselors for the sixties, Wrenn (9) has projected roles which are more definitive than those in the ASCA statement. In particular, it is recommended that:

a. a school counselor ally himself with the intellectual core efforts of a school on the basis that the primary and unique functions of the school is that of the development and use of the intellect;

b. the primary emphasis on counseling students be placed on developmental needs and decision points in the lives of the total range of students rather than the remedial needs and crisis points in the lives of a few students, with the major goal of counseling being that of increased self-responsibility and an increased maturity in decision-making skills upon the part of the students;

c. vocational choice be seen as a process extending over years and not as an event, that the student be helped to make a series of choices as he becomes increasingly realistic about himself and the occupational world, that urging a student to "make up his mind" in the sense of a final settlement may be considerably more harmful than helpful.

Emerging Roles of Professionally Trained Counselors

At this juncture, it has become rather clear that school counselors' roles are rather comprehensive and certainly not as definitive as those of rehabilitation and employment counselors. School counselors have generally been committed to assisting pupils with long-term developmental needs and decision making processes - some voices would have them in their work emphasize educational and career development processes with all pupils and de-emphasize crisis needs of a small minority of pupils. Rehabilitation counselors have been committed to vocational adjustment of disabled persons. Their perception of vocational adjustment can accommodate long-term developmental processes utilizing total resources of an agency and a community; and therefore they are more closely akin to school counselors than employment counselors. The latter group have had definitive roles linked with vocational adjustment but keyed to short-term counseling and job placement. However, as employment counselors provide expanding services for a wider clientele, such as those in youth centers, work camps, urban centers, and for other parts of the poverty program, they will undoubtedly find roles associated with the "old" program only partially adequate. The ultimate goal of vocational adjustment may still be appropriate, but immediate goals will have to become more closely allied with developmental goals, such as those of school counselors and rehabilitation counselors. Individuals who are neither immediately educable nor employable face a succession of developmental tasks over a relatively longer period of time. As a consequence, if they are to provide more than palliative measures, employment counselors' roles will become less definitive and more dependent than formerly upon the developmental needs of clients.

For some reason the ASCA statement, although recognizing the concept that a school counselor is an educator, does not explicitly align itself with the intellectual development of students. In contrast with the Wrenn study, the ASCA statement does not emphasize career development as one of the major foci of a school counselor's work. (A summary of research (6) indicates that pupils, parents, and teachers expect a counselor to be more helpful with educational and career development than he would be with personal-social problems.) Nor does the ASCA statement take a stand on crisis- versus developmental-oriented counseling. Omission of a stand relative to crisis counseling from the ASCA statement points up an issue that has not been resolved, e.g., to what extent does a counselor become involved in treatment with pupils who have crisis needs? Wrenn has indicated that a school counselor must not invest his time heavily with crisis needs, which presumably become therapy-oriented, and must leave psychotherapy or treatment to specialized school personnel and/or community mental health resources. This latter philosophy permeates at least one other pupil personnel service, e.g., the emerging role of the school nurse who is becoming more of a consultant on health practices than a dispenser of band-aids.

FUNCTIONS OF PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED COUNSELORS

The task of describing functions of professionally trained counselors in different settings is comparable to that of clarifying roles. Counselors in all settings have some basic functions in common with each other; however, the social need which created the setting and which utilizes counselors has also dictated functions having qualities somewhat unique to each setting. Again authoritative statements have been examined to determine functions which are similar and those which have unique qualities for the different settings.

Functions of Employment Counselors

The Employment Service Manual (5) is relatively specific regarding employment counselors' activities. Their functions are clearly related to roles listed in a previous section of this paper. In a cyclical pattern, the following activities or functions suggest the limits associated with an employment counselor's work.

1. Helps the counselee identify and understand the various aspects of his employment counseling problem.
2. Obtains and evaluates information about the counselee which may have vocational significance.
3. Arranges for tests when appropriate and considers the results in relation to other pertinent counseling information.
4. Gives pertinent information to counselee on occupational requirements, employment opportunities, and trends.
5. Helps the counselee analyze and evaluate his vocational assets, to relate them to possible occupational goals, and to make an appropriate vocational choice.
6. Assists the counselee to discover and overcome any barriers which may have prevented him from finding or holding suitable work in his chosen field.
7. Helps the counselee formulate a vocational plan to achieve his goals.
8. Assists the counselee to initiate action in line with his plan.
9. Conducts group counseling sessions with counselees, as needed, to supplement individual counseling interviews.
10. Refers the counselee to other community agencies for training or other services not provided by the Employment Service.
11. Follows through after counseling to promote action toward attaining the goal. He may promote job development contacts by other staff members in behalf of counselees unlikely to be placed in regular operations, or on occasion may personally make such contacts.
12. Follows up, as necessary, after placement, to determine suitability of the placement and extent of vocational adjustment.
13. Records counseling interview, summarizing the problem, the significant facts that bear on the problem and the plan.

Of the thirteen activities, five of them (numbers 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7) are explicitly related to the counseling interview. These activities are concerned with helping a client to define his employment problem, understand occupational life and opportunities, understand his own attributes, find any barriers to finding and holding a job, and formulate a vocational plan - all activities closely tied to an employment counselors' role(s). The remaining seven activities involve study of a client (number 2), collection of data to further study of a client (number 3), group counseling (number 9), referrals to community agencies (number 10), job development in needy cases (number 11), follow-up or evaluation (number 12), and record keeping (number 13). Activities, such as research to stimulate program development, consultations and case conferences with professional personnel, and consultations with people significant in the lives of clients, to mention a few of the more obvious possibilities, are not found on the list.

Functions of Rehabilitation Counselors

Functions of rehabilitation counselors have not been placed as succinctly in list form as has been the case of employment counselors in the Employment Service Manual. This condition may be due to the many agencies and situations in which rehabilitation counselors find a demand for their services - and no list could encompass counselors in all rehabilitation settings. However, quoting some statements and paraphrasing others from the monograph, Rehabilitation Counselor Preparation (3), made it possible to develop the following list of functions for rehabilitation counselors:

1. Locates possible clients, encourages and accepts referrals, and interprets rehabilitation services to them.
2. Establishes eligibility of disabled individuals.
3. Evaluates the client through interviews and through other approaches to data collection. Data regarding needs and interests; employment and educational background; psychological, medical, and socio-economic history of the client and family must be obtained and interpreted.
4. Work with client to develop vocational goals and a rehabilitation plan. He interprets findings of the evaluation, discusses vocational opportunities, helps a client recognize and accept his limitations, helps a client plan for physical restoration, training, and other services

necessary to attain his goal, appraises client's potentialities to finance his rehabilitation.

5. Confers and/or refers a client to other agencies whose assistance may be needed in the rehabilitation process.
6. Executes the rehabilitation plan, making necessary arrangements in addition to a continuing evaluation of the client and his progress in rehabilitation.
7. Assumes responsibility for placement and frequently takes part in the development of a suitable job or on-the-job training opportunity for the client.
8. Develops occupational, educational, and other kinds of information resources.
9. Assists in the induction, orientation, and supervised services which are required in counselor education curricula.
10. Performs certain administrative duties, such as efficient management of case load, files and records, correspondence and reports, and instruction to other personnel in case load and work flow supervision.
11. Assists in developing and improving community services to disabled people, including concern about public opinion and understanding, involvement in community action programs, and the development of all types of facilities and resources necessary to rehabilitation.
12. Assumes responsibility for his continued professional development through reading professional literature, keeping abreast of current research, and attending professional meetings.

Actual functions which directly involve counseling interviews have been subsumed under one item on the list (number 4). Although counseling is a major function, and probably quantitatively the one item could be expanded indefinitely, it is complemented by many other important functions. Probably the most visible set of functions are those which reach out and influence prospective clients, lay people, the community, placement with businesses and industries, and rehabilitation counselor education programs. These attempts to go beyond activities associated primarily with counseling activities have been made explicit for rehabilitation counselors - certainly some of these activities are implicit in duties assigned to employment counselors. Besides activities inherently connected with the rehabilitation of clients, such as establish the eligibility of clients (number 2), executing and checking progress of a rehabilitation plan (number 6), developing a job suitable for a disabled client (number 7), developing information resources (number 8), and performing certain administrative tasks (number 10), this list includes stress upon the rehabilitation counselor's professional development activities (number 12) - again an activity which may be implied but not always explicit in lists of duties associated with other types of counselors. In many respects, both an employment counselor and a rehabilitation counselor have sufficient structure in their functions to discern rather clearly how they intend to carry out their roles.

Functions of Counselors in Educational Institutions

Much of the discussion devoted to counselor roles at different educational levels is also pertinent to a discussion of counselors' functions. The great mass of professional literature has been concentrated upon functions of secondary school counselors. The following statements, therefore, describe secondary school counselors' functions as perceived by the American School Counselor Association (2).

1. To provide counseling relationships with pupils for the purpose of helping each pupil to understand and to accept his aptitudes, interests, attitudes, abilities, opportunities for self-fulfillment, and the interrelationship among these.
2. To provide counseling relationships with pupils conducive to developing personal decision-making competency.
3. To provide consultative assistance and, through studying children, provide information to all members of a school staff for the purpose of understanding the individual child.
4. To provide information (and conduct research) for program development to staff members, information about pupil educational and psycho-social development, in addition to significant changes in the school and non-school environments which have implications for instruction and the psycho-social well-being of pupils.
5. To provide consultative assistance to parents for the purpose of helping them understand the developmental progress of their child, his needs, and environmental opportunities, for purposes of increasing their ability to contribute to their child's development.
6. To interpret to the community the importance of consideration for the individual and the contribution of the school counseling program to that end.
7. To promote in the community non-school opportunities necessary for pupil development.
8. To use and/or promote community resources designed to meet unusual or extreme needs of pupils which are beyond the responsibility of the

school.

9. To coordinate his efforts with other pupil personnel specialists.

As perceived by the American School Counselor Association and other authorities, school counselors are heavily committed to counseling (numbers 1 and 2), and a wide range of consultative relationships with parents, teachers, school administrators, other pupil personnel workers, and community agencies (numbers 3, 5, 8 and 9). They are also expected to provide information (possibly through action research) for the development of the educational program (number 4) and community resources (number 7) to interpret counseling to the public and champion rights of individuals (number 6). Although school counselors' functions are not as distinctly described as those of rehabilitation and employment counselors, they follow the pattern usually associated with professionally trained counselors whatever their work setting.

Composite Functions of Professionally Trained Counselors

Any attempt to synthesize functions of all professionally trained counselors into a meaningful list is defeated by the very roles demanded of counselors by the nature of their work settings. It is, consequently, necessary to present functions in a generalized manner, a strategy that may not describe the functions of some counselors, such as those in employment services (where specificity of functions may take away some autonomy associated with professional counseling).

The following functions are not explicit in every listing of counselor functions; but they occur with sufficient frequency to be associated with the professionally trained counselor.

1. Helping Relationships
    a. Counseling, both self-referral and referrals from other people and agencies, on the basis of client needs unless a counselor, recognizing his professional limitations, feels he cannot provide adequately for a client's needs and refers the client to another source of assistance.

b. Small group work with clients, or other people concerned with the welfare of clients, including staffing cases and case conferences. Again a counselor's professional limitations determine the nature and use he makes of this approach to helping relationships.

c. Consulting with a wide range of people who are significant in the lives of clients, such as family, community agencies, employers, teachers, public personnel workers, physicians, and other specialized personnel and services in the community.

    (1) Assists with all steps necessary for effective referrals, including adequate knowledge about available resources.

    (2) Plans and follows through the development of environmental conditions which foster development of clients and optimally meet their needs.

2. Supporting Activities

a. Client-environment studies. As long as a client is associated with an institution, agency, or hospital, a counselor engages in comprehensive developmental studies of the client in his environments and the implications of developmental trends for services, educational and occupational possibilities, etc.

b. Program development. Shares whatever administrative duties, such as testing, developing information resources, or record keeping, are necessary to providing optimum services.

    (1) Participates in and, on occasion, designs research intended to evaluate services, such as follow-up studies, and to focus attention on conditions which might indicate a need for new or improved services.

    (2) Assists in pre-service and in-service induction and supervision of experiences which are required in counselor education curriculums.

(3) Assumes responsibility for determining case load and balance among functions associated with his work.

c. Public relations. Accepts responsibility to explain goals and methods of, in addition to realistic expectations from, a counselor's work to lay people.

d. Professional development. Affiliates with and participates in organizations that provide professional stimulation and improvement of professional services; also plans regular reading program, including current research. Participates in graduate study, workshops, practicums and conferences intended to provide in-service, refresher experiences.

The division of counselors' functions into two broad categories, Helping Relationships and Supporting Activities, is a logical way in which to group them. A counselor is expected to spend a significant proportion of his time in helping relationships; but successful functioning in helping relationships is dependent upon a number of supporting activities. Maintenance of a cohesive balance among helping relationships and supporting activities is a counselor's professional responsibility.

Helping relationships have been defined as broadly as possible. A counselor may utilize counseling, small-group work, and consulting activities in various complementary combinations, taking responsibility to select an approach (a prerogative of the professional worker) which he feels is best suited to the needs of a particular client. As used in this array of functions, both counseling and small-group work are concerned with helping processes, the central purpose of which is to enable a client to utilize the resources he now has for coping with life rather than for the purpose of changing basic personality patterns (7, 8). Consulting with a wide range of other people, services, and community resources, is a natural part of helping relationships because a counselor utilizes whatever resources might complement and reinforce learnings from counseling and group-work relationships. A counselor is action-minded and not only helps a client understand himself and environment, explore alternatives, and develop plans, but in addition, through consulting, helps marshall resources in the environment to the end that they support a client's efforts to realize his plans.

Supporting activities can add to the efficacy of helping relationships, or they can represent "the tail that wags the dog." In over-organized settings, they can rob a counselor of his initiative and creativity in helping relationships. In his resistance to an octapus-type of organization, a professional counselor can over-react and neglect supporting activities. If accorded their proper place in the spectrum of counselors' functions, supporting activities include "housekeeping chores" in addition to duties which directly influence the effectiveness of counseling, small-group work, and consulting. These latter duties are of three types, studying clients, improving total programs of services and developing higher level counselor competencies, for the basic purpose of improving services through which clients may fully meet their needs.

As a result of attempting to understand three prototypes of settings where professionally trained counselors are employed, the writer could not help feeling that two of the settings described functions which would enhance a counselor's work as a professional person. On the other hand, one of them, the employment service setting, placed unwarranted restrictions upon counselors. These restrictions are not readily apparent in any statement of functions, but rather show themselves in administrative controls which are placed upon counselors who are attempting to carry out their functions, viz., a rather rigid interpretation of what kinds of activities are and are not counseling, thus prescribing how a counselor must perform his work in order to be credited with a counseling contact. Such administrative procedures are probably necessary when employment counselors are lacking in professional qualifications; however, they are also degrading to professionally trained counselors who are expected to exercise judgment and responsibility in terms of client needs. The point to this observation is a very simple one, namely, statements of roles and functions are important guidelines to counselors or to any professional group but, at the same time, unless counselors are permitted to work with some autonomy and to make judgments without administrative interference, they are not professional workers however much preparation or experience they may have for their work.

REFERENCES

1. American Association for the Advancement of Science. Identification and guidance of able students, Report of conferences on testing and counseling, University of Michigan, Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1958.

2. American School Counselor Association. Statement of policy for secondary school counselors and guidelines of implementation of the ASCA statement of policy for secondary school counselors. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1964.

3. Hall, John Herrick & Warren, Sol L. (Eds.) Rehabilitation counselor preparation. Washington, D. C.: National Rehabilitation Association and National Vocational Guidance Association, 1956.

4. Institutes for Human Adjustment. Training of psychological counselors. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1950.

5. McGowan, John F., & Porter, Thomas L. An introduction to employment service counseling. Prepared for Missouri Division of Employment Security. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1964.

6. Roeber, Edward C. The school counselor. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.

7. Thompson, Albert S., & Super, Donald E. (Eds.) The professional preparation of counseling psychologists. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, pp. 52-57.

8. Tyler, Leona E. The work of the counselor. (rev. ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, pp. 12-4.

9. Wrenn, C. Gilbert. The counselor in a changing world. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

FUNCTIONS AND EFFECTS OF "SUBPROFESSIONAL" PERSONNEL IN COUNSELING

by

D. A. Hansen, Assistant Professor
University of California,
Santa Barbara

Severe shortages in skilled and trained specialists today threaten the effectiveness of many occupations in our society, as demands for 'expertesse' multiply within a vital economy and expanding technology. Few professions, however, are so hard pressed as counseling, and its situation promises to grow worse: a demand for 32,000 additional full-time counselors by mid-1967 was projected in the 1963 President's Manpower Report -- dramatically, more than a 50 percent increase over the total number of full-time counselors in 1964 (Wrenn, 1965; 57). To many, the projections are ominous, suggesting demands that will suppress all efforts to improve or even maintain the working conditions and effectiveness of the counselor.

To relieve the pressure on the qualified, it seems reasonable to train and employ "subprofessionals," or technical aides. The idea is neither new nor radical: aides have for years effectively absorbed demands on a wide range of professionals, including nurses, librarians and (in the form of graduate students) professors. Doubtless, the subprofessional could similarly perform many of the more routine functions of the counselors.

There is an important difference between previous development of subprofessional aid and the current programs in counseling, however: those earlier developed slowly and from the impetus of local organizations and professional bodies. The subprofessional in counseling, however, is a federal innovation, an imaginative though hurried response to perceived shortages in the client services essential to pursuits of national potence and social equity. Because of the scope and strength of this impetus, the experience with subprofessionals in other occupations is of only limited relevance.

For prime example, it is important but insufficient in the case of counseling to merely identify those things the semi-trained is competent to do and those he is not.[1] When programs grow slowly and only with local support, the negative effects which invariably accompany innovations can be met and dealt with as they develop. In a program of national scope and urgency such leisureliness could be costly. Not only immediate, but latent consequences must be anticipated and programs modified before permanent damage, however unintentional and unnecessary, results.

The heat of the current debate, then, is not a product of frivolity; however indirectly, a highly legitimate and vital question is addressed: How, if at all, will current and feasible programs for training and utilizing subprofessionals influence the current and potential social contributions of counseling?

Even in such a simple form, the question clearly demands comprehensive perspective of far greater breadth and depth than it has yet enjoyed. It is also clear that debate, however reasoned and objective, cannot be limited to established facts, for when facts are few, they allow but blindered myopia. However risky, imagination must be allowed responsible play and, at least in early phases of discussion, it must be allowed to play at the level of generalization and abstraction.

Three general qualities appear critical to the effectiveness of any professional who serves clients: competence; adequate autonomy to exercise the competence; clarity of professional (or service) image, to give responsible direction to efforts. The last two are the subject of the following speculations, which suggest that counseling effectiveness depends not only on the qualities of the invididual counselor, but also on the existing relationship to his employing organization and his profession. Hopefully, in the perspective of this relationship, some insight can be gained into the immediate and latent effects of subprofessional programs on the social contribution of the counselor.

---

[1] Though important, the questions of subprofessional competence is of limited concern. It is apparent that, generally, the less qualified will do only those things the more qualified are not available for. Likely, too, counseling will be able to attract some of the more competent from the available ranks of "semi-trained," which today include increasing numbers with college experience and degrees, and talented women who today find a career after child-rearing socially acceptable as well as personally desirable.

PROFESSION AND ORGANIZATION: THE STRUCTURE OF EFFECTIVENESS

To the legion of names which have been applied to the contemporary era, another might be added: The Age of Occupational Confusion. Today even the most traditional professions are under the stresses of rapid change, requiring new accommodations by doctors, lawyers, professors, and others to their communities, colleagues and administrators. These professions evidence strain, yet each is strong with resources which help to moderate change, to minimize the blurring of their professional image, and to even profit from internal disagreements on professional goals, duties and rights.

Counseling, however, is less fortunate in the resources with which to meet stress. However much the profession has grown in the past half-century, its professional boundaries, its social goals, and the significance of its service are disputed even by counselors, and questioned or ignored by the public it serves, and whose support is essential to its social effectiveness. Counselors are well aware of inadequacies in their profession, and invest great energy in discussion of standards, methods, goals and levels of counseling. It has been charged that such concerns are but thinly disguised status striving, and likely there is truth in the distortion: In a society infested with status anxiety it would be strange if counselors were immune. Rejection of their claims and efforts on such grounds, however, could be costly, for professional status does not result merely in increased prestige and income for individual members. Far more importantly, it results in a strengthening of occupational resources, in greater ability to support the individual member in his professional activity, in increased social effectiveness.

The critical qualities of professional potence appear to be elusive, however; efforts to increase resources often degenerate into low-yield attempts to emulate selected qualities of the most prestigious professions. If, for instance, medicine and law both evidence a code of ethics endorsed by all members, extended training and esoteric knowledge, then (it might be argued -- fallaciously) if counseling adopts a code of ethics, upgrades its training and elaborates its theories, it will automatically be, undeniably, a Profession.

It is not being suggested that counselors drop their concern with standards, certification or codes. Rather, it is being cautioned that in themselves such efforts are only uncertain aides to a more effective profession, and that, unless placed in larger perspective, they may so command the attention of professional leaders that other, less concrete resources will be neglected and social currents undercutting the resources will not be fathomed.

The development and support of professional resources that is, must be recognized not simply as functions of the efforts of associations or individuals, but also of the organizations in which the individuals work. Within the context of societal expectations and values, the conflict and accommodation of these determine in greatest measure the limits of counseling effectiveness.

In great part, the qualities and resources of counseling, and its ability to meet the problems it faces -- not only in the utilization of the subprofessional, but in virtually every phase of the profession -- are a close function of the organizations in which counseling takes place. The very diversity of these organizations -- schools, universities, private and public agencies of assorted types -- influences the profession, encouraging idiosyncracies in service ideals, in job-identity and in orientations to clients, that frustrate the development of solidarity within the profession.

Beyond the diversity, however, counseling is strongly influenced by general processes the organizations share. These processes are of particular importance in determining the subprofessional's role and his influence on the effectiveness of counseling.

Autonomy and Organizational Restrains

The nature of an organization is such that it does not readily grant autonomy to members. To obtain organizational goals, efficiency and rationality must be maximized, resulting in explicit procedures, rules and standards -- all of which constrain independent action. Some positions, however, are granted considerable autonomy because of their specialized professional contributions, which it appears can best be made if constraining regulations are minimal. Lawyers, doctors, and professors, for example, continue to enjoy professional autonomy, even though they today are usually employed in large-scale organizations; tradition, statute and regulation protect their position, and the protections are supported by strong professional associations.

Though few, if any, counselors would raise serious claim to such autonomy for members of those professions, neither would they allow that the counselor is merely a technician, whose specialized activities require little more independence than is necessary to a clerk or receptionist. They would point out that, even when in an agency where programs and goals are set by others, the counselor exercies special competencies, offering the client a degree of humanization in the most routine of programs, and serving the agency with an ability to influence, to manipulate, to cool-the-mark when cooling is needed, and to clarify and inform in ways which have meaning to and effect on the client.

It is apparent that to perform these and other counseling functions requires some autonomy, that effectiveness of the most competent of counselors is limited by the range of activities in which the organization consistently allows him to be governed by his own (presumably, professionally responsible) evaluations, judgments and decisions. Certainly, considerable autonomy is essential to effective work in therapy and identity problems, but even in functions requiring less flexibility, time and protection of privacy, some is required. Professional autonomy may be a luxury for the person whose job is to match occupational information to test results, but at least a middling amount is required by, say, the employment counselor who would, in reality, "...integrate the counselee's other needs with his employment needs." And help him "...clear up any adjustment barriers..." to employability. These dimensions of Employment Service Counseling are seen by Louis Levine, Director of the U. S. Employment Service (Levine, 1964; 3).

Simple statement of administrative policy and even creation of facilities for autonomous operation do not in themselves guarantee that the individual will in fact be autonomous, however. It is possible, for instance, that a specific organization, in maintaining control over work-rates and case loads, virtually binds the counselor to ritualized counseling relations.

It should be clear that the closer the counselor is to administrative concerns or responsibilities or the greater his dependence on administrative favor, the less likely is the kind of autonomy which is necessary to his effectiveness. For any organizational program which would contribute to the general public welfare must, whenever possible, strain toward general standards which apply to all workers and to the public or clients, must attempt to limit dealings with clients to a narrow range of concern (such as desire and competence for a job), and must focus on the potential achievements of the client. Effectiveness of many counseling functions, however, is impossible within such relationships -- the counselor who would aid in adjustment or creative growth must be emotionally permissive with his client (risking discovery of problems not directly concerned with the agency program, and hence encouraging program inefficiency), must evaluate the client on his unique and diverse qualities, rather than merely on his achievement potential.[2]

Because of these differences in needs, the general processes of an organization -- unless checked by the administrator -- will interfere with counselor effectiveness, not only by limiting his autonomy, but by frustrating his efforts toward the sort of service he may see as professionally worthy. Such frustration may be experienced even in the professionally-oriented school counseling systems, where the appearance of autonomy is often in great part deceptive, as the counselor is placed in a position of responsibility to an administrator, who is dedicated not to a professional concept of counseling, but rather to the effective operation of his school. Through channels of communication and reporting, and the availability of counseling files, and requests that counselors aid in resolving diverse school problems, the required autonomy is denied.

---

[2] Parsons' (1951; 58-67) "pattern variables" of relationship may be seen here: in his terms, organizations if unrestrainted encourage client-counselor relations which tend to be universalistic, specific, affectively neutral, achievement-oriented and place collective needs before individual; many counseling functions, however, require relations which are more particularistic, diffuse, emotionally permissive, ascriptive and oriented toward individual needs.

Autonomy, however, is not simply a function of the relation between the individual counselor and his superiors; more generally, it involves the resources of his entire profession, and most critically, its social license and solidarity.

Autonomy and Professional Resources

To gain and maintain autonomy in the organization, the individual must convince his superiors and colleagues that his services are both somewhat rare and important.[3] For the professional, the strongest of supports for such a claim are the solidarity and the social license of his profession.

By social license is not meant merely certification, but something far broader and less explicit: acceptance by the society of a claim to engage in a special type of work. Within the profession, the strength of the claim is closely related to both the solidarity of the members, and the clarity of the Service Image (or the social mandate or mission of the profession).

> Not merely do the practitioners, by virtue of gaining admission to the charmed circle of colleagues, individually exercise the license to do things others do not, but collectively they presume to tell society what is good and right for the individual and for society at large in some aspects of life. Indeed, they set the very terms in which people may think about this aspect of life. The medical profession, for instance, is not content merely to define the terms of medical practice. It also

---

[3] This is facilitated if the organization is infused with "professionalism," for in such an environment, the resources of any one professional gain from those of the others, even though they are in differing fields (see Wilensky, 1964; 147).

tries to define for all of us the very nature of health and disease (Hughes, 1958; 79).

Solidarity refers to the identification of members of an occupation with one another, an awareness that they are in some ways similar to one another (and, hence, different from the rest of society), and a commitment to maintain that similarity. Solidarity may be evidenced in the subscription of individuals to the policies and dictates of their professional association. The number of professional associations in counseling is a major indication of both deficiences and growth of solidarity in the field. Not one, but two major associations today exist and in one, the APGA, six semi-autonomous divisions continue to hold a greater loyalty of many members than does the parent association. Yet growth of solidarity is indicated by the very existance of APGA (for not long ago the seven divisions were independent) and by its continuing efforts to expand membership, for example, among Employment Service Counselors of whom less than 200 (of over 3,000 eligibles) are members (McGowan and Porter, 1964; 191). Another indication of growing solidarity must be seen in the 1965 joint publication of the ACES and ASCA policy statements, which seek compatability with the policy of the parent APGA (APGA, 1965).

Solidarity deficiencies are also reflected in the lukewarm commitment of many not only to their associations, but to the very profession of counseling: many are far more committed to their employing organizations,[4] many see counseling as not highly significant, many treat it as a transitional occupation. Even at the Ph.D. level, it is not uncommon that the young counselor aims not to follow a career in counseling, but to seek a strategic move to administration, university teaching, or some other position more prestigious or lucrative. The noticable lack of solidarity -- and the noticable gains -- are particularly telling indices of the support the individual counselor can and cannot expect from his profession.

---

[4] Especially in agencies, they appear more "local" than "cosmopolitan" in orientation, and consequently more responsive to organizational than professional controls. For a general discussion, focusing on the position of scientists in industry, see Kornhauser (1962).

Solidarity, however, is reciprocally related to license, and there seems to be an increasing public willingness to grant license to counselors, to turn to them for specialized services. Parents, especially in surburban areas, not only allow but expect vocational and educational counseling for their children. Vocational and rehabilitation counselors are widely sought; even those who distrust the counselor and feel no need for his services, mutely suffer interviews and tests which are necessary to gain a job, a degree, or some sort of official acceptance; however resentfully, by their silence acknowledging the counselor's license. It appears widely accepted that the counselor has a right to dispense information, facilitate agency and school programs, and even engage in some adjustive, therapeutic, rehabilitation and disciplinary work; within limits to diagnose and evaluate, to advise, to urge and assign. In many ways, however, such license is only hesitatingly granted by the public and strict controls are placed on it. Even the activities the counselor is generally granted are suspect, as is evidenced in the now perennial criticisms of tests and the people who administer them, and in the image of counseling presented in literature. The damning caricature by Hersey in The Child Buyer, of the counselor as an opinionated, semi-competent dupe is far from unwelcome to many persons. Popular resistance to counseling is shared by some professionals, such as economist Eli Ginzberg (1960) who, impressed with the training deficiencies of many counselors, suggested that they should not only limit themselves to vocational problems, but do more than disseminate occupational information. Many counselors would agree that training is still inadequate, but few would draw such pessimistic conclusions. Indeed, as will be suggested, there are strains within the profession not to limit, but to broaden appeals for license and mandate.

For example, in counseling, one of the most critical of rights is that to withhold knowledge which is "guilty," or at least potentially embarrassing and dangerous:

> It may be guilty in that it is knowledge that the layman would be obliged to reveal, or that in the withholding of it from the public or from legal authorities compromises, or may compromise, the integrity of the man who has it and does withhold it (Hughes, 1958; 81).

Although compared to the psychiatrist, the counselor to date has asked for only limited rights to guilty knowledge, his professional effectiveness in many functions rests in great part upon such license. Efforts to increase the license are seen in the occasional discussion of the counselor's ethical responsibility toward his client, as contrasted to the law or to his employing organization. In total, these discussions suggest that the counselor does not desire great extension of license for guilty knowledge, as is reflected in the 1961 APGA Ethical Standards, which call for confidentially of information, "consistent with the obligations of the member as a professional person"; when the member learns of "conditions which are likely to harm others over whom his insitution or agency has responsibility" he should report to the appropriate responsible authority without revealing the counselee's identity, and that if the client's condition requires that others "assume responsibility for him or when there is clear and imminent danger to the counselee or client or to the other," the counselor is expected to report or take "other emergency measures." (APGA, 1961.) Even this limited statement of license, however, is an idealization, often contradicted.

The license to guilty knowledge, as has been suggested, today often appears to be influenced less by the individual counselor or his professional associations than by the organizations in which he works. Requirements to keep files which are open not only to other counselors directly involved with the case, but even to non-counselors, in many ways circumvent efforts to maintain professional responsibility to the client; explicit definitions by agencies or schools of the roles of counselors place strict limitations on his opportunities to actualize the license that he thinks he has been granted.

Limitations of the license of the counselor are also indicated in the fact that the actual setting of minimal standards and requirements is only in small part a professional activity. As in teaching, counselors employed by schools and agencies must meet standards about which professional associations may have been consulted, but which in fact were determined and set by administrators and even laymen, such as school board members. Lacking solidarity, the professional associations such as the APA, ACES, ASCA, and APGA, though far from impotent, face heavy odds in their efforts to do more than advise and consent in the setting of standards of their own profession.

It must be emphasized that, though they may be limited, the professional resources of the counseling profession today appear stronger than ever, and that there is a trend toward increased autonomy for many members. At the same time, however, the profession faces strains and challenges of a magnitude previously unknown. The question is not whether professional resources have strenthened, but whether they have strengthened adequately.

EFFECTS OF THE SUBPROFESSIONAL

The thread of the previous discussion can be tugged slightly, to suggest that:

1. Organizations generally resist claims to autonomy;
2. Effective counseling requires some autonomy, governed by professional, rather than organizational responsibilities; in some counseling functions, particularly those toward which the profession is today straining, the autonomy requirements are considerable;
3. Both autonomy and the professional service image can be frustrated by the structure of organizational responsibilities, more subtly through communication channels and content (including the uses and visibility of files and records), and, simply, through excessive work loads;
4. The individual counselor who would gain autonomy must be able to convince others, especially his superiors, that his skills are both important and somewhat rare;
5. In supporting the individual's claims to autonomy, the resources of his profession are especially important;
6. The profession of counseling appears to be developing the essential resources of license and solidarity fairly rapidly, but is still limited in each. (Though in some areas of the profession, such as school counseling, considerable professional resources are enjoyed, in other areas the support is weak.)

Today, both the counselor and his profession are still rather vulnerable; though generally, organizations have been gradually accommodating to professional and individual demands for license and autonomy, the accommodation is tentative and could be easily reversed.

Into this context of tentative accommodation, a recent rash of legislation and programs have aggrandized demands for counseling services. It is possible that the sheer strength of these demands could reverse the trends toward autonomy, particularly in the agency settings, as the organization meets case loads and clerical requirements which in effect rule out any possibility of autonomy for any working counselor.

In easing these loads, programs to employ subprofessionals might appear to be blessings. Indeed, they are, potentially; but the boon may quickly become bane, unless features of the current programs are modified and avoided in the future.

"Subprofessional": Unstable Status

"Subprofessional" is at best a rather unstable category: maintaining firm boundaries between the subprofessional and the professional in any occupation is difficult. The problem is compounded in the case of counseling, as the demands on the subprofessional -- not only demands from his organization, but from his clients -- often leave him no choice but to "counsel." The effective Youth Advisor, for example, can expect to be sought for help in solving personal and vocational problems; because of case loads, often it is a matter of subprofessional help or none at all. Subprofessionals will, indeed, engage in many "counselor" roles, and in at least some of them they doubtless will be effective. (It should be noted that even computers are capable of performing many "counseling" functions, as is discussed by Loughary, 1965; 47-48.)

In such a situation, there is a high probability of confusion of subprofessional and professional -- on the one hand, their images will be confused in the client's minds and, eventually, even in the minds of administrators and other colleagues; on the other hand, their roles within the organizations will be confused, and it will be increasingly difficult to distinguish them clearly on the basis of their functions. The problem is not only the professional's -- it poses real threats to the entire organization in which he works. Such problems are inherent in any professional-subprofessional relation, particularly when the categories differ by only a year or two of university training; which possibly could have been met and resolved by foresighted and open cooperation by administrators, professional and subprofessionals.

In counseling, however, the problem is even further compounded, for the immediate efficiency of the organization may be enhanced by allowing and (however unintentionally) even encouraging the confusion, in order to meet other problems. To aid in recruitment of competent trainees and maintaining morale, for prime examples, the effective administrator will use whatever resources are available; unless the natural tendency is checked by regulation or other sanction, these problems will be met through upgrading the subprofessional -- for example, by informally referring to him as a counselor, and by allowing him to work with increasingly difficult cases -- resulting in confusion of the roles and images and, hence (as will be discussed) restriction of the counselor's autonomy and of the resources of his profession.

In current programs this is already happening. Although assurances have been given that subprofessionals will labor under another label than "counselor," the assurances are non-binding and unrealistic; it is difficult to see how they could be actualized. For experience demands reward, morale requires recognition of effort and advancement opportunities. Since there is no real restriction on the use of the label "counselor" and even the roles of counselor, as rewards for the effective subprofessional, they will be used.[5]

---

[5] The use of the subprofessional in actual counseling is not but a possibility, rather it is an actuality. Indeed, USES Program Letter 1963 (August 24, 1964) urges use of CAUSE trainees, on completion of their eight-week session, be used in such functions as "counseling youth" in state employment agencies.

The process of creating a full professional out of a tenured subprofessional is, in fact, formally structured into the program for Counselor Aides. The merits of such a program are usually argued on the question of whether counseling really requires special, formal training. The question is important, but another question is equally critical: Should administration -- rather than profession -- determine the standards for and routes to full professional status? The question bears on problems of professional license and solidarity -- and on the eventual effectiveness of both counselor and organization.

Three features in subprofessional problems, then, present undesirable problems to the counselor, the profession and the organization:

1. The unchecked tendency to confuse roles and images;
2. The unintentional encouragement of this confusion, in enhancing the morale of the subprofessional;
3. The administrative control of mobility routes to professional status.

Effects on the Organization

It cannot be emaphasized too strongly that in the long run, individual agencies and their programs will suffer as greatly as the individual counselor from reduction in professional resources. Practices which today enhance morale and facilitate programs may soon become highly destructive to agency effectiveness. Unless strict boundries are maintained between the qualified and the subprofessional, unless the identity of each is clearly maintained, the fruits promised by programs of subprofessionals may turn sour. At the present time, certain independence is allowed the professional counselor in determining objectives and activities with individual clients. If subprofessionals, however, begin to work with similar cases, it seems likely that supervisors will find it necessary to institute certain regulations and procedures, formal and informal, to guide the subprofessional, in order to maximize organizational effectiveness and minimize errors. Since the roles of professional and subprofessional will overlap to some degree many of the regulations will necessarily apply to the professional counselor.

Lacking the tradition of autonomy, and (particularly in many public agencies) the professional resources necessary to protect even existing autonomy, the counselor will be thereby restricted by regulations which have been created to regularize and make efficient the efforts of the less trained. Though he may continue to enjoy more freedom than the subprofessional, increased restriction and frustration of service images for the trained counselor are likely.

The effects on the agency are predictable. Some of the more competent counselors will move to less discouraging organizations, in which they are allowed more autonomy, some will leave counseling altogether, others will aspire to the roles of organization supervisors and other positions in which they are not in fact functioning as counselors.

The problem likely will be faced not only by public agencies, but also by private agencies and schools. In general, it will require a decision on the part of the administrator: whether to encourage simple facilitation and efficiency in current programs, or to seek a more lasting effectiveness. Often, administrators voice a preference toward the latter; if they would pursue the preference, they will have to forego some temporary efficiency, to support and create positions for counselors in which they are allowed to operate with greater autonomy and professional responsibility. Indeed, if they would maximize the social contributions counseling today might make, and those far greater contributions that it promises to offer, administrators should closely examine the entire structure of authority in which the counselor must operate. It has been shown in other organizational situations that maximal returns from the professional experteese of an organization requires special structures of authority, parallel to, and quite different from, those which yield most efficient use of technical personnel (Simon, 1957).

Particularly in the elaborate school counseling systems which are staffed by highly qualified and specialized personnel, administrators should examine the authority structure, for it may well be that in existing structures, development of counseling is being thwarted. Delegation of authority to a "master-counselor" is not likely to help greatly, for delegation of authority usually, however subtly, involves also delegation of responsibility to the administrator. What is required, to allow professional autonomy, is not delegation, but allocation of authority, or a division of responsibility, requiring that "...each unit in the organization is assigned some specific area over which it has exclusive authority, and that the decisional premise of any individual that fall within this area are subject to that authority" (Simon, 1957; 141).

Members of the counseling profession are far from unaware of such a possibility. (See Peters, 1963; Shertzer and Stone, 1963; Kehas, 1965.) Kehas, approving Simon's general discussion, suggested: "My concern arises not from a concern with administration *per se*, but from a growing realization that some current administrative thought and practice impinge severely on the purposeful development of guidance in many important ways..." (149). It appears, however, that current programs for the utilization of subprofessionals will force agency administrators to move in the opposite direction.

The practices -- encouraging image and role confusion that will lead to the need for standardized procedures and, hence, restricted autonomy -- will also have significant effects on the profession.

Effects on Professional License and Solidarity

It has been suggested that current uses of the subprofessionals will allow the administration, rather than the profession, to determine mobility to "professional" status. This critical threat to the developing professional license, the challenge to its right to control even its own membership, should be obvious from the above discussion, and need not be elaborated here. The practice likely will have effects on professional solidarity as well -- not only by discouraging the qualified counselor, but also by discouraging the eventual professional identification of the subprofessional.

In such close dependence on the administrative powers of the agency, and lacking the extended training which encourages clarity of professional purpose and dedication to professional ideals, the subprofessional will find few inducements to forming a professional identity. It seems reasonable that most subprofessionals, entering the counseling field from a variety of backgrounds, will seek and expect greatest satisfaction in their client-relationships (rather than in their relationships to their professional colleagues, or in the knowledge that they are helping realize a shared, professional service ideal). In the almost inevitable frustration of their search for satisfaction in client relationships, they may either leave the field in discouragement, or seek satisfactions in career aspirations. If it is apparent that mobility decisions rest in the hands of the administrator, the subprofessional will turn his attention to organizational relations, thereby minimizing his demands and needs for eventual professional autonomy. Although at first glance this may appear administratively desirable, it is in fact not, for it encourages rigid limits to eventual effectiveness of the subprofessional in all but the lowest level of counselor functions.

In frustrating the development of professional solidarity within his organization, the administrator may (ironically) forfeit a powerful support of morale. The employee who is dedicated to professional service and identifies with others in his profession who similarly serve will strive for effectiveness in the face of far more frustrations than will one who is professionally "isolated." This is but one reason, yet an important one, why both counselors and administrators should give close attention to the development of professionally-determined routes of mobility even within the individual agency.

This, and other problems in current programs for use of subprofessionals have been recognized in professional associations, resulting in various recommendations, most notably those of the Professional Preparation and Standards Committee of the largest body, the APGA. At a June 1964 meeting, it offered a statement which evidences recognition of the complex problems of mobility, competence, and levels of functioning:

> It is recognized that there may be job situations requiring only certain technical skills and it would be possible to train individuals for these specific skills in limited periods of time. The amount of training would have to be fully compatible with the specific needs of the job situation. Furthermore, the expectations of job performance of individuals receiving such training should be limited to only those specific skills for which they are trained and for which competent supervision is provided. Extension of their functions should be limited to tasks compatible with their own abilities and personal characteristics and for which the necessary additional training has been received. Qualified individuals should be encouraged to undertake planned graduate programs leading to the point of their ultimately becoming a professional counselor (APGA, 1964).

To the APGA, a professional counselor is one who has completed a two-year specialized university course in counseling or guidance -- a requirement which appears reasonable, though perhaps inadequate. Extended training is generally important to effectiveness, for it not only teaches about counseling, it also communicates tacit knowledge, which though unarticulated is profoundly important to professional effectiveness. By this is not meant simple technical knowledge, or a capacity to theorize in Freudian or phenomenological jargon:

> As Michael Polanyi reminds us, "there are things that we know but cannot tell": The doctor's recognition of the characteristic appearance of the disease, the taxonomist's recognition of the specimen of the species -- these are like our everyday recognition of the identity of a person, the mood of a face; they are acts of understanding complex entities which we cannot fully report...
>
> The expert may be defined as a man who knows so much that he can communicate only a small part of it... The element of tacit knowledge in the sciences and professions help explain their achievement of exclusive jurisdiction... (Wilensky, 1964; 149).

Such knowledge cannot be gained in the practical setting, where the individual counselor is beset with a constant stream of exigencies (which also offer new tacit knowledge, not offered in the universities). McCully's admonitions are refreshing:

> I am now inclined to ask bluntly, when are we going to get intellectually honest about the method being used in counselor certification? While the concept of certification is sound and essential the method historically used to certify counselors contains a strong element of phoniness... What is needed to take the phony element out of the present general method of certification is to base certification upon reasonable assurance that the candidate, in fact, is a counselor and is prepared to undertake the individual and social responsibilities involved in functioning as a school counselor. This is not an easy task, but it can be done and there are alternative ways of doing it (1965, 122).

Presumably, McCully would not suggest that university education should not be a requirement of certification; but rather, that it alone would not be adequate.

The importance of university training for all counseling functions can be exaggerated, however. In a later resolution (not yet approved by its membership), the APGA proposed that "...state employment services be enjoined to assign to professional counseling duties only those who are qualified for such positions, after a reasonable time for the graduate education...." Unfortunately, the resolution does not clearly identify what 'counseling' is. If it means any relationships which involve evaluation of diagnosis, with the intent of facilitating decision making or clarification, then the resolution appears unrealistic, for many subprofessionals have been and will be placed in situations in which they have no choice but to counsel.

To draw the line between professional and subprofessional at the level of "counsel" or "not counsel," even if workable, would be unnecessary. The line must be drawn, it is apparent, and be drawn very clearly -- the question is, where? One possibility is to locate the line at that point at which the special qualities and characteristics of the qualified counselor become critical. If the educated layman with eight or six months of special training is able to engage effectively in 20, 50 or 60 percent of the counseling situations the qualified counselor now spends his time with, then it seems reasonable to turn these activities over to the subprofessional.

The line, that is, might be drawn at that place at which the "esoteric knowledge" of the counselor becomes essential. It is difficult to tell exactly where such professional knowledge -- tacit and explicit -- become crucial. One possibility would be to identify the degree of standardization that is possible for a given counseling task; or, to look at it from the other side, the degree of autonomy necessary if the task is to be effectively accomplished with a wide range of client personalities. It is being suggested that counselors attempt to identify professional "levels" of counseling not simply by designating a "proper" level of training for any task, but by identifying the degree of receptivity to routinization and the degree of autonomy the task requires.

Beside seeking greater control over status mobility, the profession can also seek to minimize the destructive effects of subprofessional programs by explicitly defining opportunities for the professional affiliation of subprofessionals. To protect professional resources, efforts to allow them full membership in associations must be discouraged, yet some affiliate status might be offered, as one mechanism for developing a professional identity. It would be a mistake to grant this status too readily, however, for then it would mean nothing; it would be as great a mistake to make it difficult to obtain, for then the association would be ignored or resented by the growing body of subprofessionals. Though this problem may not be so pressing as those of mobility control and of identity and role confusion it requires immediate, penetrating consideration.

Effects on the Development of Counseling Potentials

One more facet of the current debate over subprofessionals deserves special consideration: What should be the role of the university in training the subprofessional?

It is generally agreed today that the university must play an active role in the community and nation, that it can and should make its special contribution to vital programs. If the university has a special contribution to make, however, it is because its resources are unique; and it is because they are unique that they cannot go unused. In training subprofessionals, unfortunately, the unique resources are in greatest part ignored, as counselor educators are put in a position where they can do no more than simply expedite the accumulation of technical skills.

The University, however, also has only limited resources of time and energy of its skilled and expert personnel. The problem is as simple as this: If university time is spent on one thing it cannot be spent on another -- and other tasks are far more important to society than is low-level technical preparation, which can be done (perhaps even more effectively) by other agencies.

Programs such as CAUSE can divert university staffs from other efforts which are crucial to the development of counseling service. Motivated by a sense of responsibility as well as by the funds offered by federal programs, individual professors may redirect their attentions, and those of others: such programs require the attention and efforts of colleagues, graduate students and university administrators. In short, the programs offer inducements which can redirect the emphasis of entire departments.

Redirect from what? From efforts to improve the preparation of qualified counselors, for one thing. For another, from efforts to develop the knowledge and practices necessary to more effectively encourage individual human development.

For counseling holds two critical potentials for our society -- one of which is easily neglected. Even in the profession the two are not always clearly differentiated, even though they differ markedly in requirements. The potentials can be seen in the struggle for recognition during the past half century of two general images of counseling; images which at times seem to fuse, but at others emerge as distinct, revealing contradictions among their compatabilities. In most simple statements, the images are, on the one hand, to further the collective good (for instance, aiding in manpower utilization) and, on the other, to further the individual good (for instance, aiding in development of self). Though such statement is illuminating, it is inadequate in its simplicity.

For one thing, it is immediately apparent that either image requires also consideration of the other: Individual and society are not in polar opposition, but interpenetrate; one cannot be understood without understanding the other, neither can change without the other changing in some way. The question, then, of whether counseling serves either national programs or individual growth invites attack: It is obvious that it can, and does, serve both -- even that a single action of any one counselor can further both at the same time.

From this insight, it is a journey of only a few steps to the idea that there need be no real tension between the individual and society and, hence, that the distinction between the two images is artificial. Short journey it may be, but the few steps must be made over a dizzying chasm, which offers no bridges. For, although collective and individual needs may often be compatible, they remain far from identical; however effectively the two _can_, ideally, coexist, they by nature must coexist in some tension. It is a demonstrable fact that individual needs do clash with collective needs, at times overtly, more often subtly, the conflict imperceptible, unarticulated, yet profound; it is apparent that the demands of neither individual or society can or should _always_ be honored, and that the conflicting demands of both often must be.

In this perspective, the service images are revealed as less polar: _On the one hand, there exist today marked strains to improve abilities of counseling to maximize effectiveness of societal programs_ (e.g., the programs of the OEO, Department of Labor, HEW), _in such a way that restraints on individual autonomy and development are minimized_.

On the other hand, there exist strains to improve abilities to maximize individual development, in such a way that impositions on society are minimized.

Counseling is one of the few professions today so situated that it might contribute in both ways; but to date, most effort has gone to the first. In many ways, the most encouraging development in contemporary counseling is the strain in the universities toward the second image, the increasing clarity of concern for the role of counseling in developing individual autonomy and identity, that is not a luxury supplement to our educational system, but a critical need.

Programs such as CAUSE could not alone discourage the development of this counseling role; but they could help drain its vitality. This possibility, however far-reaching its implications, is but one reason for close attention to current programs for training and utilizing subprofessionals in counseling. Other reasons have been suggested and implied above; still others are yet unarticulated. They suggest that modifications in current and future programs may be necessary if counseling, the counseling organization and even counselor education are to be maximally effective.

REFERENCES

American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1961. "Ethical Standards." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 40:206-209.

APGA, 1964. "The Relationship of Short Term and Specialized Programs to the APGA Policy Statement, The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role," Report of the Professional Preparation and Standards Committee.

APGA, 1965. *Counseling, A Growing Profession* (J. W. Loughary, Ed.), Washington, D.C.: APGA.

Ginzberg, Eli, 1960. "Guidance-Limited or Unlimited?" *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 38:707-712.

Hughes, Everett C., 1958. *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Kehas, Chris D., 1965. "Administrative Structure and Guidance Theory." *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 4:147-153.

Kornhauser, William, 1962. *Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. California Press.

Levine, Louis, 1964. "What is Employment Service Counseling?" *Employment Service Review*, 1 (No. 12): 1-6.

Loughary, 1965. "New Challenges for Counselors." In APGA, 1965, 43-52.

McCully, C. Harold, 1965. "Regional Concern and the National Interest in Guidance." Counselor Education and Supervision, 4:115-124.

McGowan, John F., and Thomas L. Porter, 1964. *An Introduction To Employment Service Counseling*, Columbia: Univ. of Missouri.

Parsons, Talcott, 1951. *The Social System*, Glencoe: Free Press.

Peters, Herman J., 1963. "Interferences to Guidance Program Development." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 42: 119-124.

Shertzer, B., and S. C. Stone, 1963. "Administrative Deterrents to Guidance Program Development." *Theory Into Practice*, 2: 24-32.

Simon, H. A., 1957. *Administrative Behavior* (Rev. Ed.), N. Y.: Macmillan.

Wilensky, Harold L., 1964. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 70: 137-158.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert, 1965. "A Second Look." In APGA, 1965, 53-66.

CRISIS IN COUNSELING: A COMMENTARY AND (POSSIBLY) A CONTRIBUTION

by

C. Gilbert Wrenn, Professor
Arizona State University

This paper is, by design, a commentary upon the two preceding papers. With this in mind I shall proceed directly to the task, first commenting upon what has been presented by Roeber and Hansen, and then suggesting some solutions to the issues raised. Because this is to be a personalized paper I shall not hesitate to use the first person rather than the more authoritative but impersonal third person. This makes clear that the ideas expressed are my own only and do not necessarily represent any body of thinking within the profession.

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

Roeber has chosen wisely to develop his discussion of counselor roles and functions in three selected settings--employment counseling, rehabilitation counseling, and school counseling. These are certainly ones in which the impact of government subsidy and support are or should be most clearly delineated. There are many other counselor settings. In the schools, for example, counseling in the junior college, the university, and the elementary school is now beginning to benefit from the provisions of the 1964 National Defense Education Act. Roeber chose well for it would have been much more difficult to have defined the role of the counselor in the junior college or the elementary school than in the secondary school inasmuch as the relationship of the counselor to the teacher and other school specialists is much less clear than is true in the secondary schools. We also have counseling in city welfare departments, in the church, in Veterans Administration installations, in the new Office of Economic Opportunity Centers, in business and industry, etc., but the three selected by Roeber are by all odds the best in terms of relative clarity of function and the immediacy of government concern.

The last statement, it should be noted, is far less true for the employment counselor than for either of the other two. It is a little hard to understand why attention has been given to the professional development of Veteran Administration counselors (13 years), rehabilitation counselors (11 years), and counselors in schools (7 years), and colleges at all levels, but no systematic attention at all to the professionalization of employment counselors. With the Employment Service serving a great national need in caring for people who are in transition from occupation to occupation as well as from job to job, with the urgency of this need increasing almost by the month, and with Congress loading more responsibility on the Employment Service year by year, the lack of foresight in supplying qualified counselors is inexcuseable. Hopefully, there is a bill before the present Congress, as there was before the last Congress, to provide fellowship subsidy for employment counselors of the sort now available to school counselors and rehabilitation counselors.

The distinction between roles and functions made in Roeber's paper is a critical one. It is a distinction between purpose and process, between ends and means. What was implied without being clearly stated is that the Government, and society generally, may well be concerned with the roles of the counselor in different settings, that is, the job to be done, the part to be played by the counselor, but they distinctly should not be responsible for statement of functions. Functions are the business of those professionally qualified to determine the procedures to be used, the business of counselors and professional associations of counselors. In the illustrations used it is clear that professional associations of school counselors and of rehabilitation counselors have undertaken this responsibility. They not only have stated the functions that are to be performed within these professions, but they clearly understand that these functions must be restudied and restated from time to time.

Functions and Roles of the Employment Counselor

This action of a professional association is definitely not true in the case of employment counselors and herein lies one of the differences between the employment counselor and those in the other two fields. A study of the development in these three fields over the past ten years suggests that there is a relationship between the amount of attention given by the government to professional preparation and the undertaking of responsible action by professional associations of counselors in these fields. There is a far less clear-cut professional association of employment counselors and, in part at least, as a consequence of this, statements of employment counselor function are regularly developed by the United States Employment Service and transmitted to regional offices and state offices. It is true that these functions are developed by professionals in the Headquarters office and frequently in consultation with professionals in the field, but the fact remains that the responsibility for statement of functions has not rested with counselors themselves but with the government agency. This should be changed. Employment counselors must soon assume the responsibility of their own statement of functions if they are to be professionals.

Roeber also makes clear that the role of the employment counselor must change as the Employment Service adapts itself to work with youth and adults in wider settings than the traditional employment office and as they meet the problem of millions who are in transition status because of radical changes in the occupational structure. His discussion of the responsibility of school counselors and rehabilitation counselors for long term developmental needs and for attention to utilization of the total resources of agency and community makes clear that these emphases must prevail in employment counseling as well. For these reasons I cannot agree with Roeber that the employment counselor's role is "clear cut and unequivocal." Perhaps it is, but it should not be!

The employment counselor's role has clearly moved from minimal counseling relating to placement on a job to a concern with counseling the individual in terms of his occupation and perhaps in terms of his total life vocation as well. This, in turn, moves back to counselor concern with client motivations for education as well as his potentials for education and continued vocational training.

These are complex processes, not simple, and they are rapidly becoming less clear cut and unequivocal as the occupational picture shifts more rapidly and as the relationship of number of jobs to number of people becomes more uncertain.

Counselor Function

After dealing with roles, Roeber provided a composite statement of the function of professionally educated counselors. This is a very useful analysis. Let me attempt a somewhat simpler statement. The function of the counselor in any setting is (a) to provide a relationship between couselor and counselee, the most prominent quality of which is that of mutual trust of each in the other; (b) to provide alternatives in self-understanding and in the courses of action open to the client; (c) to provide for some degree of intervention with the situation in which the client finds himself and with "important others" in the client's immediate life; (d) to provide leadership in developing a healthy psychological environment for his clients, and, finally, (e) to provide for improvement of the counseling process through constant individual self-criticism and (for some counselors) extensive attention to improvement of process through research.

THE NATURE OF PROFESSIONALISM

The first paper spoke only of the professionally educated counselor, that is, defining profession in terms of the amount and kind of education. A more fundamental approach to a definition of professionalism would be through analysis of what the counselor does, not how he is educated. Education is a means to an end. The full weight of evidence rests upon how the counselor performs as to whether he is to be called a professional. Hansen approaches this by defining the professional in terms of autonomy of judgment and action allowed the counselor, the solidarity of the identification of the members of the occupation involved, and the license permitted to withhold information considered confidential.

Of these important qualities the most significant, in my opinion, is the degree of autonomy permitted the counselor. It is true that organizations resist autonomy, but it is also true that organizations are likely to respect the willingness of the professional to make his own judgment if he accepts responsibility for the outcomes. For professionalism is a two edged sword--freedom to use one's own professional judgment must always mean acceptance of responsibility for outcome. This is why an organization needs a professional, someone who will pit his best brains and judgment against the situation as a responsible member of a vocation known to have competence in the field involved. This confidence, of course, is contributed to by the kind of professional education required, by the feeling of identification with and support by others in the same vocation, and by a common understanding of the ethics and social responsibilities involved.

Any professional person does many things that a sub-professional man could do as well. It is not in the particular number or kind of duties involved that distinguishes the professional from the sub-professional. _It is the manner in which he undertakes these duties and the responsibility he assumes for what he does that marks the professional_. He may take medical history or dig up precedents of a law case if he must. This does not make him less professional even though such tasks could be undertaken by a sub-professional. What he does with the material, however, the decisions he makes, the assumption of responsibility for the outcomes of his decisions are what enable others to trust him as a professional man.

Hansen's paper is critical of the counselor's achievement of professional status in schools and in other settings. I am critical, too, but for reasons different than those implied by Hansen. The critics of counseling whom Hansen and all of us have heard often are seldom versed in either the roles or functions of counselors. As a matter of fact the critics of any profession are seldom students of that profession, that is, they are not those who have studied the settings or the functions involved. They are likely to be somewhat casual observers--the journalistic writer, the business man, or even the scientist who, regardless of his standing in his own field, is neither a student of the age group or social group involved or of the institution in which the professional may operate. While members of a profession are always legitimately open to criticism by those not in the profession, it would seem to be that professional status is not determined by such critics. The degree of professionalism involved is best understood by those within the vocation itself providing they are sufficiently self-critical and have adequate standards by which to judge their behavior.

Beyond this there is a tendency to generalize from one or a few cases to all members of the profession. This is manifestly unfair. Some counselors, for example, are professionals in their behavior as well as in their preparation and some are not. I would hesitate to make any generalized statement about counselors in any setting as being professional or non-professional. And this is true regardless of the amount of education the counselor possesses. To repeat, a given counselor can be called professional or non-professional in terms of the autonomy which he demands and exercises in a given situation, the extent to which he lives up to the standards set by his own profession, the extent to which he freely accepts responsibility for the decisions made. Perhaps it could be said that true professionalism lies in the extent to which the counselor considers himself responsible for the welfare of his client and of the society of which both are a part.

Hansen's paper raises some very troublesome issues. Not only does this paper make clear some of the dimensions of true professionalism, it also makes clear that this developing professionalism is seriously threatened by any mass attempt to provide large numbers of sub-professional workers. He is deeply concerned, as am I, that the large scale employment of counselors at a sub-professional level may affect negatively not only the autonomy of the professionally qualified counselor but eventually the quality of the total service provided to the client.

TWO CONCERNS AND SOME POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Without discussing further these two scholarly papers, I would like to describe two broad concerns implied in these papers, and some possible solutions.

The Relation of Sub-professional to Professional

A crucial issue that has been clearly defined in the second paper is that the employment of any considerable number of sub-professionals permits, almost requires, that the employing organization provide careful supervision. This means an increase in the number of specified duties, the number of rules to be followed, the delineation of techniques to be performed. Perhaps all of this is within the framework of careful supervision but this supervision is likely to be given by those who have administrative authority in the organization and their attention to rules and specifications is likely to affect the professional counselors as well.

In particular, the confusion of roles and images between the professional counselor and the sub-professional is likely to result in a restriction of the autonomy of the professional and, therefore, a restriction in the use of the resources of his profession. All of this is clearly described by Hansen. In the long run it is likely true that the employing agency will suffer as professional counselors, that is professional in the sense of operation as well as education, find themselves increasingly limited by the regulations of the organization. They will simply seek a freer atmosphere in another setting. This means that the organization with the greatest number of rules because of the greatest number of sub-professionals will suffer most in the loss of professionals. In the long run then, both the organization and the clients suffer.

Why is this such a currently critical problem? In part it is because of the amount of legislation which has subsidized the employment and even the beginning education of a large number of counselors who must obviously operate at a sub-professional level. The reader of these pages will have already heard much of the large number of counselors anticipated by recent legislation. He will have or should have heard also of the serious problems involved in the short term training that is to be given to those who will contribute to the ends described in the legislation or who will carry out the purposes of the legislation itself.

Much of the purpose of manpower or educational legislation could be achieved by sub-professionals with relatively short amounts of training if fully supervised by adequate numbers of professionally qualified counselors. So then, the problem in part becomes a question of the ratio between the number of sub-professionals and the number of professionals in the same organization. Of this we will speak later.

There is another completely different reason for the current concern over the numbers of sub-professionals. Some of our social and educational agencies are in a state of transition and within this state of transition roles are fuzzy and the danger of organizational restriction is greater. Two quite contrasting illustrations might be cited. (1) The junior college is certainly in a state of transition. Its responsibility as one unit of the total public educational system has become overwhelming. Large numbers of students who are available to attend some form of education beyond high school, are said to rely heavily upon the junior college as their initial point of entry into higher education. For the majority the junior college will mean the completion of their formal education for this stage in their life. Beyond this the junior college is held increasingly responsible for the education of adults who return for further education or for further vocational preparation.

The junior college wishes to be considered an institution of higher education. At the least, it is clearly a post-secondary unit of education as education is viewed in our culture. The trouble is that the public junior college is staffed heavily by those whose educational experience and orientation is secondary school rather than college. Further, it is similar to the high school in being much more closely related to local control than is the public four year college or university. Because of this confusion between role and operation, I find student personnel work in the junior college much less clearly defined than is counseling in the high schools or student personnel work in a four year college or university.

All of this means that a counselor in the junior college has an uncertain status. Currently, there are very few junior college counselors, possibly 700 counselors for almost 700 junior colleges (Hitchcock, this Report, pp. 88). In many junior colleges the counselor is still a faculty advisor with some small degree of professional education added to his preparation as a college teacher. At this stage of junior college development he should either be certified as is the public school counselor or be permitted to operate in a manner similar to the professional personnel worker in college or university. The counselor in the junior college often does not have the scope of supporting services that is provided in the rather extensive student personnel program of the average university. Beyond this, in the public junior college most of the students live at home and are therefore closer to home controls and yet they are at the age at which they must be assuming responsibility for themselves. This calls for a professional counselor who will be different from both teacher and parent in helping this student live realistically within the bounds of his own sense of responsibility. Currently the junior college counselor is not well defined and yet the numbers of people who will be called upon to counsel the hundreds of thousands of students in junior colleges will increase dramatically year by year. Will these be counseling professionals or sub-professionals?

(2) Another transition situation is created by the nature of some of our national legislation. Non-school agencies are required by the legislation to engage not only in educational efforts but in the actual process of schooling itself. It is of course assumed that education is broader than the school and most social agencies engage in the process of education, but here we have agencies provided for under the Economic Opportunity Act which will be engaging in school efforts. I am not arguing against the wisdom of this forward thrust into societal need. I am not troubled about non-school agencies performing functions which have normally been carried out by schools. This may well be a development which has much promise for the future as well as much challenge for schools. What I am concerned about here is that in this picture the nature of the professional such as the counselor is not at all clear. Because of the urgency of the legislation certainly many of the functions will be carried out by sub-professionals, not

professionals, with no clear understanding as to the distinction between the two or the amount of professional supervision necessary in a given situation.

The broad issue here seems clear, the solutions less so. Let me propose some possibilities. What will be suggested may not be easy to accept and will need much modification, but the central thrust may prove useful.

1. One thing needed is a clear statement that can be understood by laymen of the difference between professionals and sub-professionals. This will mean that the professionals' understanding will have to be clear enough to have it translated into laymen understanding for it is most important that laymen understanding be sought. If the employers understand the distinction involved and the outcomes of any confusion of roles, it is much easier for both groups of workers to maintain their respective positions within the organization. As Hansen brought out, the history of counseling in reasonably modern terminology is not a long one, perhaps less than 50 years and there has been considerable difficulty in arriving at the statement of counseling as a profession which is understandable to the counselors themselves. Attempts during the past five years have met with some success as pointed out by both Roeber and Hansen. It is time now to move beyond the broad outline of the nature of professional counseling and sub-professional counseling which is accepted by the profession to a clearer statement of these distinctions to the employers of counselors. This will mean the elimination of a great deal of esoteric language and it will mean a statement of roles in terms of outcomes for which employers feel responsible. The point of view of both professional and sub-professional with regard to their sense of responsibility to their field of work and to their clients ought to be clearly stated, but the prime concern of the laymen employer is how his total agency job gets done and by whom.

2. Limit the number of sub-professional personnel employed in an organization to some given ratio of the number of professionals available to supervise their performance and their development. This means that the professionals must be selected for their willingness and capacity to contribute to the growth of the sub-professionals as well as to protect the client through careful supervision of

the process. There could be lip service here in terms of a stated ratio of, say, five sub-professionals to one professional, but this would be of no avail if 90 percent of the professional's time is spent in dealing with the more difficult clients. The ratio should be that of a person who has full time responsibility for the supervision and the in-service development of the sub-professionals. They are his clients. It is quite clear that under careful supervision sub-professionals, or any worker for that matter, can become increasingly proficient in the functions that are to be performed.

3. Some of us would be much more willing to have sub-professionals start their work with only a modicum of beginning training if there was some assured program over a period of time of in-service development under good supervision. A sub-professional's beginning education could be started in a summer program and this education could then be continued with graduate school on a part-time basis for the following academic year while he learns how to perform tasks of increasing difficulty in the job situation. He could be paid on an on-the-job-training basis for the nine months of the academic year and be a full time student on a student stipend during the two summers. This would provide him with more than the equivalent of a full year's graduate work plus the great advantage of conceptual and skill learnings that are achieved while working in a job situation.

One of the problems of short time summer training is that the person moves at once into a job situation in which he must translate rapidly his academic learning into specific and often quite incidental job terms. Frequently he must spend the first two and three months in learning the organization. This may be boring work and greatly diminishes the motivation which he possessed at the time he left the graduate program. I have known a number of people who seemed so disillusioned during these first few months because of the sharp break between the beginnings of professional work and a full-time job of a highly structured sort that they left the job entirely. It would be of great advantage to have on-the-job experience and academic training combined.

4. Experimental situations should be set up in which some sub-profession-

als are employed on a probationary basis only. This would mean that they would be employed only after actual observation by their peers and supervisors over a period of months. There is no way in which professional education as such can guarantee how a person will perform on the job. This is certainly true where the professional education is of a limited sort. It seems most wise then to have sub-professionals employed strictly on a probationary basis with some guarantee to them to be sure, but none beyond the first six months or the first year. This period would then be used not only for their own best development but for the screening of those who must not be continued beyond the probationary period. This need not be an arbitrary matter entirely. Part of the professional supervision given them should be directed toward an increase in their own ability to be self critical. With rising sensitivity toward himself and his effectiveness the sub-professional himself might take the initiative in leaving the program.

5. The employment of sub-professionals, particularly if what is expected is that many will remain at a sub-professional level for some time, should emphasize affective and personality factors as well as the capacity for undergoing academic preparation of an intellectual order. It is true that we have few validated personality measures for given counseling situations, but tests involving affective and interpersonal relationship factors could be given to all entering sub-professionals. These could then be validated against performance and after a given period of time be used for the screening of applicants. Dr. Albert D. Annis of the Veterans Hospital staff at Phoenix, Arizona, told me of the time when he was on the staff of St. Elizabeth's Hospital several years ago. At that time they employed a considerable number of sub-professionals and a large number of volunteers. Contributing to the success of their program was a "social perception scale" (developed by Annis) which was validated against performance on the job, that is, the rating of observers and supervisors. The scale consisted of 100 annoyance items, that is, items which might be annoying in varying degree to the individual answering the form. Such items as "people who pretend to be very virtuous," "a very self-satisfied person," "to be laughed at," "the sight of

garbage," "to see a person showing off," and so forth. The subject was instructed to mark on a four-point scale how annoying this was to himself and in the second column to indicate how annoying he thought it was to the average person. The results of the study show clearly that a low discrepancy between the two types of ratings correlated highly with the supervisor's ratings on performance. The person who saw himself as little different from others in the degree of annoyance involved got along best with others and proved to be the best sub-professional or volunteer worker. It is this type of thing that might be of great significance as we employ larger numbers of sub-professionals and as we need desperately to discover the means to select them on other than intellectual and academic bases.

Strengthening the Professional Against the Influx of Numbers

The best preparation and employment of sub-professionals is only a partial answer to the present crisis situation. The professional, who has been some decades in a slow process of growth toward "professional" status, needs protection against rapid adulteration of his distinctiveness. This sounds selfish and self-seeking but the concern is with quality of service being reduced as well as the professional counselor's identity being protected. The following three points bear on society's protection of the professional and his intelligent self-behavior.

1. The professional needs to interpret his services as contributing to the attainment of certain goals which the administrator has for his organization. There is certainly danger that the organization or employer will feel it desireable to control rather carefully the activities of counselors who are clearly operating at a sub-professional level and with only the beginnings of professional education. Beyond this, however, there seems to be a tendency for administrators to wish to control professionals as well. Much lip service can be paid by the administrator to the wisdom of having highly qualified people as professionals on his staff. The prestige pull is undeniable, but then the administrator may well wish to have the professional dance to the tune of his own administration. There is somewhat more ego satisfaction involved in the control of a highly qualified

person than in the control of a less qualified one! But administrators are rational also with regard to their organization and they are concerned with reaching certain goals and achieving certain purposes. A professional should interpret himself to the administrator as one who will contribute to some of the goals the administrator wishes to reach. The professional at times feels that the administration should understand him, but he must act reciprocally in being even more sure that he understands the administrator.

2. Provide status for the professional counselor by permitting him to rise in rank and salary by becoming a supervisor of other counselors rather than by moving into general administration as the only means of advancement. I am convinced that many professionals are tempted into administration by an imposing title and increased income rather than because they feel that they are fulfilling their own professional obligations or advancing their professional interests. Some of these people become poor administrators because many a good professional is not a good administrator. Most of them lose their impact upon the profession as a whole as well as losing the satisfactions that come to them from performing the professional roles which they had earlier chosen. The proposal is that the supervisor of professionals be elevated to the same rank and the same salary as the administrator of a program if he is to be maintained within the professional field and to be effective in carrying out his professional roles. His position would be analogous to the Director of Professional Services in a hospital.

3. If there is to be a shortage of institutions qualified to prepare subprofessionals and professionals in the field of counseling, then perhaps we should preserve the institutions having the most effective and complete graduate program for the preparation of professionals. I realize that this is a controversial and rather arbitrary solution to a problem of great complexity although it is certainly suggested by data presented in the paper by Stripling (pp.113). What is proposed is that those institutions which have the most effective and extensive equipment in the way of libraries, laboratories, and staff and the greatest amount of emphasis on top level professional preparation should prepare only profession-

als. These institutions are relatively fewer in number than institutions which could quite well give the beginnings of sub-professional education since this involves heavily the elementary concepts and skills. It is true that the sub-professional should not differ much from the professional in attitude toward client and attitudes are as important as are ideas and skill. Nevertheless, attitudes, I believe, can be developed _on the job_ under appropriate professional supervision. I would also want attitudes to be developed in relation to fellow workers as well as his clients and these can be _better_ developed in the training institution.

It is therefore possible that there should be a deliberate self-selection of the more able institutions in order to reserve their efforts for long-range and orderly preparation of top-level professionals. This is not to speak disparagingly of those who with less equipment and staff cou'd handle the sub-professional preparation because they might serve the sub-professional as well or better than the institution interested primarily in long-range top-level professional preparation. This solution should be compared with that proposed in paragraph 4. It would seem that both are possibilities for some institutions but not for others.

A FINAL PRECAUTION

Whatever is done by either graduate school or employing agency to meet this crisis of need which becomes a threat to standards of performance, _it is the client and society which is to be protected not the counselor_, either professional or sub-professional. In the long run as the counselor is given autonomy and protection society and its clients will secure better services. Protection of client and counselor is reciprocal but it should never be forgotten that it is the needs of millions of youth and adults in a rapidly changing occupational and urban world that has given rise to our total concern at this Conference. This is the end, the provision of counselors is the means. We must not confuse major and minor premise.

FROM A TECHNOLOGY OF GUIDANCE IN SCHOOLS TO THE PROFESSION OF GUIDANCE-IN-SOCIETY: A CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT[1]

by

David V. Tiedeman, Professor
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

and

Frank L. Field, Professor
University of California,
Santa Barbara

1.0 A DILEMMA FOR COUNSELOR-EDUCATORS?

We who work to produce counselors are faced with two immediate and potentially contradictory requirements. Greater quantities of guidance workers are needed both because of the exploding school population and because of a concurrent proliferation among social-change agencies outside the schools. As more organizations and more students join in the business of education, then, we professors are called upon to produce more counselors. But in addition we guidance professors are faced with an equally pressing need to improve the quality of our graduates' practice in education. We ourselves are not at all satisfied with the services current guidance practitioners offer to students. Consequently we have no choice but to pursue both quantity and quality at the same time. Fortunately it is our belief that more opportunity than danger exists in this seeming dilemma.

The essence of our proposal as counselor-educators to you Conferees who represent the various levels and functions of government and university is simple: namely, let the power of your interest in education help us to improve the quality of our future graduates' professional service to students. Their leadership, partially through in-service training, will in turn effect an improvement upon the technical practice of current counselors to give you at least some of the

---

[1] We gratefully acknowledge the helpful criticism, suggestions, and editing of Christine B. Hughes, a student, University of California, Santa Barbara.

quantity that is needed.

In other words, your support can enable us to break free of certain organizational limitations that inhibit service to students by curtailing the development of a valid guidance profession. On the other hand, however, your support could also perpetuate these limits.

If this latter circumstance is to be circumvented, our proposal must be openly derived from a basis common to both. This basis we see as the nature of democratic societies, as opposed to merely civilized societies, and our whole argument rests upon this difference.

The crucial position in our argument of this distinction between merely civilized and actually democratic societies causes us to state it immediately in Section 2.0. The present mere technological role of guidance is next laid out in Section 3.0 against the background of the distinction between merely civilized and actually democratic societies. The theory required for turning guidance-in-institutions from technological into professional activity is noted in Section 4.0. There we specify the general conditions which must pertain in order for individual freedom to survive as personal responsibility is cultivated through education. Section 5.0 further specifies the nature of these conditions as guidance-in-institutions is practiced in 1) preschool, 2) elementary school, 3) secondary school, 4) college and university, 5) education after an interruption, and 6) education under physical and/or psychological handicap. Sections 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0 then return to the challenge for this Conference, namely, the forging of a consensus in which the technology of guidance in schools can be turned into a profession of guidance-in-society without needlessly restraining the present demand for a considerable quantity of new counselors. Section 6.0 treats the matter of quality in quantity upon reorganization of society for guidance-in-institutions. Section 7.0 then further delineates the issues inherent in the relations among employers, government, and university if profession is to ensue quality as the demand for quantity grows. Finally, Section 8.0 notes the capability possible in guidance-in-institutions under adequate social planning.

2.0 EDUCATION VERSUS INDOCTRINATION DURING SOCIALIZATION: THE REAL DILEMMA

A man whose behavior coincides with the needs of his society can be described as a civilized man. As yet this has nothing to do with democracy, however. Anything from prison bars (or a fear thereof) to thorough military indoctrination can serve to make civilized actions the only feasible way for an individual to behave; few valid behavioral alternatives exist for prisoners or for soldiers in combat. And if alternatives do exist the choice not to act upon them has already been made outside the individual, according to criteria the individual may or may not accept, understand, or even be aware of.

In a democratic society these criteria do reside within the individual; indeed they must, because many alternative behaviors are feasible. There are no bars and no direct chains of command as such. So nothing tangible regularly protects individual and society one against the other. The only constant protection lies in the individual's awareness that some actions promote safety and others create danger, to self as well as to society.

Our present dilemma, and yours, lies in a growing awareness that current education is not fully meeting the task of preparing young Americans for life in a democratic society. It is failing to the degree that its graduated (not just its dropout) products do not possess all necessary criteria for voluntarily selecting civilized behavior, or revising behavior to meet social change. That is why you in government have chosen to enter the business of education, and why you have asked for our help. But it is also the reason why we in education need your help. Unless you can make it possible for us to develop educators who are more concerned with wise individual choosing than with any particular action chosen in advance by others, the educational system will continue to fall short of its democratic goal. And because none among us will permit the evolution of undemocratic forms of "education" designed to assure "democracy" in advance, it seems that we here are the ones with only one feasible alternative. We must seize this opportunity to reexamine our joint goal of democratic education, and to do so with full awareness both of old failures and new developments in American

education. Let us now look at these old failures in relation to the technological role of guidance (Section 3.0) and then go on to propose new developments in American education in relation to additive guidance (Section 4.0) as potentially practiced through the several institutions of the Great Society (Section 5.0).

3.0 THE TECHNOLOGICAL ROLE OF GUIDANCE

The point has been made before that current guidance practitioners are largely trained to supplement the functions of administration and teaching (Field, 1964 a & b; Sprinthall and Tiedeman, 1964; Tiedeman, 1964 a & d; Tiedeman and Field, 1962). This results in various technical guidance specialties having two things in common:

1) **all are remedial in nature; and**
2) **all have as their goal a better fit of individual students into some existing organization or process.**

Reduced to the lowest common denominator, then, guidance is given the task of bringing individual behavior up to some level or in to some pattern previously determined by society or the needs of some organization within society. A number of serious problems are created by this technological role. However, one basic problem is of great relevance to this Conference.

Each of the many functions assigned to guidance personnel has become the special concern of one or more governmental agencies, often at several different levels within the federal system. Consequently financial support for counselor-education has been fragmented, to focus upon specific social ills - or at best, social needs. For example, counselors are now supported on a specific basis to help:

1) **dropouts;**
2) **delinquents;**
3) **underachievers;**
4) **victims of automation, urbanization, poverty;**
5) **potential scientists, engineers, teachers; and**

6) handicapped.

The list is presently extensive; it could become endless unless we begin to act to generalize rather than to fragment further. The power of specific support to fragment guidance theory and practice is overwhelming. We end up with so many different kinds of "counselors" that it becomes a rare professional convention at which one does not discover some group practicing "his" function under some "outlandish" label or "bizarre" context.

It is no wonder that guidance has not become a profession under these conditions. Over-arching theory cannot develop without communication among specialists. And professional judgment regarding policy is not invited from technicians or even permitted if it would alter the organization such technicians are hired to maintain. Yet there has been development, not yet of a profession perhaps, but certainly of a plan for building one. It has taken place partially in university schools of education where professors find the time (and the unspoiled impracticality of bright students) to imagine what guidance would be like "if...". It has taken place partially within professional organizations, too, where practitioners cannot help but see the shortcomings in what concepts, techniques, and apprentices we can provide them (Loughary, Stripling, and Fitzgerald, 1965). So there is a potential resolution to our present dilemma. It involves three aspects, all of which are now feasible with your help:

1) an emerging theory capable of integrating most guidance technology;
2) a logically possible alteration of the existing educational authority structure; and
3) the possibility of unified support (from you) for counselor-education with the freedom to produce leaders who will act upon rather than simply for the organizations hiring them (again, you).

The remaining task is to report each of these aspects in detail. But detail will be useless unless it is clearly understood that fundamental changes eventually will be called for in guidance and in its philosophical, scientific, and applied contexts. Some of these can safely be predicted, and it may help through their presentation here to clarify the subsequent discussion.

1. There is a great difference between:
   a. the direct control of individual behavior that is accomplished by limiting the available alternatives; and
   b. the influencing of individual behavior by expanding the store of information upon which decision-making criteria (values) are based. (Our graduates would add more (b) to the present educational structure.)
2. Educational-vocational choice, when made by others for an individual, is a personnel function; education requires choice for self, and the unfortunate possibility of error. (Our graduates would want you to accept this risk.)
3. Group or individual counseling of any kind and/or degree of intensity can be either psychotherapy or therapeutic. When its goal is to bring individuals "up to" some predetermined level it is psychotherapy. When its goal resembles Samuel Gompers' unachievable goal of "more" - in this case more individual development regardless of present level - it is only therapeutic and therefore synonymous with education. (Our graduates are not therapists, but they perform any identical functions.)
4. All students need "more" and we must begin to budget and staff for all rather than the x percent who need remedial help.
5. There are too few competent counselors available to waste their time performing administrative, personnel, and other such tasks peripheral to education. Counselors, too, need their aides and clerks.
6. The potentially disruptive role of "balancing off overly indoctrinational teaching" is only a temporary "counter-revolutionary" stage. Eventually the roles of teacher and counselor will be more alike, or at least more compatible. (Teacher-education is changing, too.)
7. In a democratic society the only way to influence individual behavior

is through education; i.e., helping the individual see why one particular pattern is more generally desired (with the clear understanding that it may not be desirable for some, and also that eventually some individual may prove to us that we were in error). Consequently we are proposing an educational function that is not restricted to school contexts, but is relevant to all institutions and agencies which intend to influence the behavior of individuals; our term "guidance-in-education" (Tiedeman and Field, 1962) is no longer adequate to indicate the expanded areas of counselor influence. We therefore here adopt the wider term, "guidance-in-institution."

8. The practice of guidance toward which we are working is not based solely or even primarily upon academic psychology, sociology, economics or indeed any other single behavioral science. Neither is it mostly counseling with individual students, or clinical psychology, or measurement, or social work. Consequently no single academic department nor professional specialty can define or indeed in any way control the basis for our training processes.

These are the basic issues, stated here so they can be considered apart from the more (pedestrian) problems of practical application.

4.0 FROM REMEDIAL TO ADDITIVE GUIDANCE

4.1 Ethical Principle in Purposeful Action. As noted, the differentiation of guidance practice in institutional frames has so far primarily been justified on demonstration that correction can occur only after an effect has appeared (Sprinthall and Tiedeman, 1964). For instance, guidance practice now attempts to alleviate delinquency, by identifying and then helping pre-delinquents. Another case in point is the alleviation of poor choices of college. There are efforts to identify and then to help those likely to pick a college unsuitable to their needs and abilities. In short, the profession of counseling now generally conceives its practice as the corrective application of insight from behavioral sciences for the client by the counselor. Completely absent is the more positive concept that students can become competent to use these same insights for themselves, provided only that one first learn to express such data in terms comprehensible by, and applicable to, individual students (Field, 1964 b).

This process, more analogous to exercise than to first aid, did not catch the fancy of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health (1961, pp. 318-320). Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists think largely of secondary prevention in schools (Allinsmith and Goethals, 1962) not of the primary prevention possible through guidance-in-institutions.

In order more clearly to delineate the preventive function of guidance, e.g., facilitating individual choosing rather than forcing a choice, we have advocated that guidance be practiced as an embryonic science - namely, a science of purposeful action (Tiedeman and Field, 1962). However, the ethical principle inherent in purposeful action can, through misapplication, limit individual freedom in either of the following two ways:

1. If the counselor attempts to make people purposeful, he can succumb to the theory that he should condition clients to the acceptance of goals determined by him either alone, or in some form of consultation with the group to which he belongs. The consequence is that the client is denied the one thing guidance counselors must promote and safeguard for him, namely the experience of determining his own goals.
2. If the counselor attempts only to make clients more willing to be purposeful, he can also succumb to the theory that he can shape the client's will by favoring purpose as it appears in the client's behavioral repertoire. The consequence is that the client may report purpose but not be capable of acting purposefully (Field, 1964 a).

The counselor can avoid the pitfalls of conditioning inherent in the goal of "purposing through institution" (Tiedeman, 1964 a) if he simultaneously attempts to help his clients become both willing and purposeful. The client is encouraged 1) to assess and examine his purposes by evaluating and planning on a

5

very personal level, and 2) to understand and, hopefully, later appreciate the goals of others. At this point voluntary compromise becomes possible, and, lo and behold, we have a citizen emerging who can be trusted to exercise his freedom responsibly. What greater goal can there be for education? As Bruner so gracefully notes (1963, p. 122) the process and goal of education have become united within the individual who is acting both willfully and thoughtfully.

4.2 Logical Conditions Needed in Purposing Through Institutions. If an institution's intent is to develop individual purpose without impinging upon individual freedom, it is necessary that the client 1) know of goals and their bases as favored by others, 2) experience the expectation that he will learn how to evolve goal-directed activity of his own accord, and 3) continually subject his wishes and expected responsibilities for purposeful action to critical examination. The client must be expected to acquire all three of these conditions. The teacher must work primarily in the realm of the first two in order to facilitate their acquisition at more than a spontaneous rate. The counselor must work primarily with the latter two activities. Such a complementary allocation of responsibility permits use of the behavioral sciences, but remains consistent with the expectation that human activity can and must be self directed if man is to be both the benefactor and the initiator of society's goals. Since the whole process of assuming responsibility rests on the individual's concurrent discovery of his own goals and those of society, it becomes mandatory that society's officers participate in the process. Direct counseling is not enough to facilitate a client's awareness of society's expectations. Employers, social workers, teachers and other of society's officers must team with the counselor in the course of deciding on a program of guidance activities. Such conferences absolutely must occur when there is such a diversity of people responsible (jointly and severally) for the education or reeducation of any set of clients.

However, placing expectations before clients through the teaming of professionals places new demands upon leaders. The tricks of leading teams of professionals are 1) to resolve enough issues so that the common intentions emerge reasonably clearly, but 2) not offering comfortable resolutions to so many of the really unresolvable issues that clients need not confront issues. If they do, they miss the productive tension of knowing that the goals of the social officer and the counselor are really divided, since the former is more directly concerned with the interests of society and the latter with the interests of the individual. Since the client himself divides officer and counselor, it is important for the client to know this; but, he must not have his life thereby over-determined by the goals of either professional.

4.3 Theory. The theory needed for the practice of guidance as purposeful action without limitation upon individual freedom must be restricted by the logical argument just presented. No one theory of such nature now exists. However, rudiments of theory necessary for professional practice are to be found in the present theories of 1) cognitive development, 2) the development of intelligence, 3) ego development, 4) career development (Tiedeman, 1964 b) as well as in 5) sociological observations on a) collaborative activity in general and work in particular, b) mental illness, and c) education. However, the theory of purposeful action is now without the basis necessary for its development as practice. What is needed is a paradigm which places the person in relation to what are presently known as the behavioral sciences, and then deals with the process of experience during goal-formation as well as goal-oriented behavior. Miller, Galanter, and Pribram (1960) and Tomkins and Messick (1963) have initiated the development of the needed psychology of purposeful action. Also we (Tiedeman and Field, 1964) have commented upon the measurement problem in a science of purposeful action. Field (1964 a, 1964 b) has further delineated the needed science, practice, and training for practice.

4.4 The Profession of the Science of Purposeful Action Applied Through Institutions. We have noted that the freedom of the client requires independent but collaborative application of 1) a theory of socialization, and 2) a theory of purposeful individual action. A professional cannot offer the client free access to the professional knowledge if he is restrained from doing so through organizational control. Hence the cold hard fact of guidance, as the science of purposeful action, is that at least one counselor in every institution, though under control of an administrator, must have the freedom of practicing as a professional rather than as technician under direct administrative control. This does not mean that the needed professional would be free of all demand or accountability. It does mean, however, that the professional should have freedom repeatedly, as circumstance warrants, 1) to elect his goals within only a general framework which he and the administrator have agreed to let serve as constraints upon professional practice, and 2) to elect his means within the limits set by goals and resources. Tiedeman has elsewhere (1964 d) further specified the relationships needed in the institutions of education.

Although it would be desirable to have all counselors in an institutional unit trained and acting as professionals, extent of demand versus supply does not now, or probably in the near future, permit the luxury of the ideal. However, the ideal organization we favor cannot be compromised below one professional person per institutional unit without threat to the freedom of clients. (Yes, we are aware that we mean this even if the client is the only one to be served. Furthermore, we mean this even if the institution is in a rural area with relatively few clients. Our argument hinges on the logic of freedom through intelligence, not on the economics of numbers.)

Given at least one professional person per institutional unit, it now becomes possible to _deal_ with the issues of freedom within the practicalities of personnel and cost. _The answer lies in the fact_ that a counselor must always act with the freedom of a professional. Until he acquires information, skill, confidence, and/or trust, he must serve under supervision by a person who has. The necessary supervision should be frequent and undertaken just as in any other professional apprenticeship. The goal of such supervision should be to qualify subordinate employees for counseling _without_ supervision as rapidly as possible. And before becoming even a subordinate employee, experience can be gained through practicum training which helps to enhance the process of applying theory to practice which is so essential (Conant, 1963).

5.0 GUIDANCE-IN-THE-INSTITUTIONS OF A GREAT SOCIETY

5.1 The Problem of Quantity. If guidance-in-institutions becomes the goal of those who practice counseling and psychology, the need for counselors could expand up to fifteen-fold. A ratio of 100 clients to 1 counselor borders on excessive load for the task here envisaged for guidance-in-institutions. Our approximately 53 millions of students, unemployed, and variously handicapped need to be served by about 526,000 counselor/psychologists. This number is from 10 to 15 times as many as are now employed. The further development of theory could probably reduce this demand, because clients eventually might not need continuous service. However, whatever the theory, more counselors are definitely needed. Furthermore, more counselor educators are needed. Finally, more universities are needed which can provide an adequate professional education for counselors.

We hold it to be self evident now that clients and workers need contact 1) earlier, 2) more frequently, 3) more intensively, 4) more comprehensively, and 5) longer than we now allow for in our social process of moving persons from early childhood into adult life. Clients and workers also need working independence, particularly an independence capable of sustaining the loneliness of forced leisure and retirement to say nothing of forced job and home dislocation and sometimes actual loss of jobs and homes. A new social fabrication is needed for the Great Society in order to provide continuity of income - and subsequent security - as well as to overcome the decrease of regular and meaningful social contact which will result from less work and more contact of man with machine. The ultimate goal will be achieved only when people feel sufficiently in control of their specific living conditions so that general conditions can be permitted to change. Guidance-in-institutions can provide the currently sorely lacking ingredient of personal independence. Socialization of longer duration, better quality, and greater generality will also be required, however.

5.20 The Organizational Frame Needed for Guidance-in-Institutions. In

Section 4.0 we argue that the techniques of a science of purposeful action can have an indoctrinating rather than a liberating effect. For example, students who reach high school already "cleansed" of initiative are likely to be led, not enlightened, by counseling. The way to avoid this does not lie solely in improved high school counseling; it is also necessary for a fully professional counselor to be deeply involved in educational policy-making as well as practice from the very beginning year, through every level and branch. "Guidance readiness" deserves just as much attention and cultivation as readiness for reading - or indeed any other subject matter or skill. The attainment of this ideal requires reorganization in 1) preschool, 2) elementary school, 3) secondary school, 4) college and university, 5) education upon the interruption of education, and 6) education under physical and/or psychological handicap. We shall now detail the needed reorganizations.

5.21 Preschool. Counselors are ordinarily not employed in preschools because the preschool teacher herself acts as counselor because she is ordinarily reasonably well trained in psychology. Hence the needed change in the organization of preschools requires 1) introduction of at least one teacher with more training in cognitive processes and more responsibility for their cultivation because the introduction of school subjects to the child is indeed a sensitive matter, 2) the revision of training and responsibility of our present psychologically-trained teachers so that they can also function as counselors in collaboration with other subject-trained teachers, and 3) the provision of a structure of authority in which a teacher more specialized in elementary cognitive processes and a counselor more clinically trained can work collaboratively in providing an atmosphere in which learning remains voluntary because learning tasks remain individually meaningful. Obviously, the work of the counselor in the new structure must find expression in non-verbal as well as verbal media. Furthermore, there are natural limits on the capacity for reflection upon self at the preschool age. Therefore, reorganization in preschool should indeed be cautious because there are unresolved philosophical issues of desirability as well as unresolved psychological issues of possibility and means.

5.22 Elementary School. The teacher is now the prime, and frequently the only, officer of instruction in elementary school classes. Psychologists see children upon referral but are now largely limited to cure by means of environmental change (i.e., change of teacher) or the reordering of subjective experience (psychotherapy) - to that small extent which the budgets of schools permit psychotherapy. Psychologists also now develop the education of emotionally and/or physically handicapped children. However, when counselors are entered into elementary education through teams of teachers, additive rather than just intensified and/or remedial possibilities open up, and the concept of guidance-in-education comes closer to being a reality.* Counselors' operations within teams of teachers can be given the authority and responsibility necessary for the goal of developing personal responsibility for learning as we have defined it.

5.23 Secondary School. Junior high school offers students opportunity to elect their studies for the first time. The secondary school also incorporates for the first time the status differences among alternative studies, and offers perhaps the first opportunity for the mistaking of knowing for valuing. Teachers maintain their central position in the secondary school. The present program in guidance sometimes starts to orient pupils hastily at Grade 6, as they face transition to junior high school, and then meets children more regularly only as they enter into junior high. Counselors in the secondary school deal primarily with choice in relation to 1) course of study required by career, during secondary school, 2) college, with movement from type of college to acceptance by, and of, a specific college, and finally to anticipation of majors in specific colleges, 3) if college is not elected, employment with movement from type and level of occupation (Roe, 1956), and finally 4) to anticipation and acceptance of a specific job. Except for problems which arise in connection with the course placements of students and with an increase in school dropouts, counselors now have little direct contact with teachers. And when they do, it is often of an administrative nature. For example, when Johnny becomes too difficult to handle, or is underachieving, he is sent to the counselor for a good "talking to." Counselors occasionally do play a part in "feedback" into instructional plans. In the overall view it is evident that counselors are relatively inactive in at least four areas:

---

*These are the same goals for counseling in the other institutions within our general consideration such as employment, hospital, etc.

1) the design of their own guidance role;
2) the on-going planning of curricula to meet students' changing needs;
3) the improvement of teaching techniques; and
4) the assurance that students are profiting from whatever changes are made.

In other words, counselors are not correctly using their knowledge to fit school to student; just the opposite, they generally work to fit student to school, and as it stands. Techniques, materials, personnel organization, and the attitudes of the principals toward guidance-in-education are all in need of modification in the future secondary school. The teaching of decision-making as it is now being developed is worth considerable attention in the on-going development of programs.

5.24 College and University. In college the professor ordinarily reigns supreme. Missing is a collaboration among those diverse educators influencing the process of student decision-making. To an incomplete degree, there are some efforts to integrate education through programs organized in conjunction with the housing and activities of college students. Also encouraging are efforts, through testing and counseling bureaus and through institutional research, to provide service not only to instructors in conjunction a) with the placement of students in courses and b) with course examinations, but to students in conjunction with a) course planning, b) the election of majors, c) the exploration, choice and entry into graduate school or immediate employment upon graduation. Also there are efforts to aid students (volunteers as well as referrals) in on-going evaluation of their decision to remain in college or to go to work. These services are sometimes offered in conjunction with the student health service. With this kind of service, distinctions in counseling and psychotherapy become very critical for effective collaboration among instructor, psychologist, and physician. Overall collaboration between instructor and counselor has a marked effect upon the achievement of liberation through education, even in liberal arts colleges. Obviously, the president of a college and/or university must himself understand liberation through education as well as excellence in scholarship if the integrated program which we advocate is to ensue.

5.25 Education After an Interruption. Complete knowledge is never fully achieved by anyone. Thus in a real sense, any implication that it is possible to provide a terminal education is necessarily undesirable. The main goal of education should be to help students comprehend both the necessity, and the inevitable inadequacy, of allegedly terminating points in knowing. The main problem in education is to have teachers who can make use of the integrating power of theory, the better to communicate knowledge, while at the same time communicating the incompleteness of current theory. Only under this condition will students feel free to question, to be creative, and where possible to progress beyond their teachers in a discipline.

In order for counselors to enhance this student freedom even with more dogmatic teachers, then, it is necessary that they relate themselves to each student as the supervisor of the student's learning. Supervision takes place in the analysis and criticism of experiencing. Therefore, it is necessary for counselors responsible for the supervision of learning to be able to offer students a valid opportunity for independent action. Thus the counselor must engage in observation, analysis, and feedback regarding the student's efforts at independent action sufficient for the student to become master of the whole process. When a scheme such as this exists, it is possible to offer even so-called vocational-technical education (Tiedeman, 1964 c) to students in such a way that they obtain 1) content, 2) experience in the technical process under supervision, and 3) transition and induction into employment as education, not training. With such an education the student puts his expectations and skills to use, but does so with recognition of his employer's expectation that work is a mutually valued activity, not just an employee valued activity. This latter understanding is necessary for realization that skill may remain while its value varies.

We have engaged in a reiteration of this paradigm of education because it is necessary in order to consider the problem of providing guidance-in-institutions for adult education. At the present time, counselors do not participate very deeply in these processes. Those who do are largely involved in the process of orientation during intake. There may also be involvement in the placement of those who "finish." Ordinarily there is little or no involvement with the supervision of the student's learning, however.

The same has been true of employment counselors who tend primarily to receive, classify, and dispatch persons in need of work. In the same way, the conception of Youth Opportunity Centers and of other rehabilitative programs planned in the anti-poverty program presently suffers from failure to realize the educational nature of the position of counselor which each includes.

The possible separation of rehabilitation from education would be humorous if it were not so tragic. In the effort to "do" something that educators have failed to do, the U. S. Department of Labor presently assumes it can do better without doing any differently. It also assumes it can do as well without a backlog of experience. Furthermore, in its fervor for immediate action the Department of Labor occasionally assumes dimensions of a university seemingly without even blushing. For instance, the Department even recruited and selected students, and gave out certificates to the counselor aides who participated in its CAUSE program during summer 1964. Perhaps the U. S. Office of Education has just a little to contribute to the problem if the Department of Labor would invite participation. Obviously, we also think that guidance-in-institutions has a lot to contribute if the task of new goal formation for the despairing were truly framed and financed as an educational venture despite the label and location of the administration of programs.

Industry itself contributes to the reformulation of goals by its employees when it provides educational experience within its walls. For instance, the Polaroid Corporation presently has an extensive program of career development through counseling and teaching which is organized for employees interested in advancement and/or job change contingent upon predicted production changes. This is a part of guidance-in-institutions. Even at Polaroid, however, there is general absence of the concept of supervision of the experience of the student during his development of purpose.

5.26 Education Under Physical and/or Psychological Handicap. Although those with physical and/or psychological handicap are surely worthy of attention, there is no reason why these people should be the sole responsibility of a program of guidance-in-institutions. Rather, programs for the physically and/or psychologically handicapped should be a part of the regular organizational framework for education which we have advocated. In such a framework, where instruction is provided by other qualified people, it is possible for counselors to work more effectively with the supervision of students as they choose among alternative educational "stairways." The counselor will find that physical and/or emotional disability places unusual conditions upon individual purpose. It is up to a professional counselor to know what is needed in such instances, to do what is necessary and possible, and to refrain from action other than referral when he is not qualified to provide what is needed.

6.0 QUALITY IN QUANTITY UPON REORGANIZATION

Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1957, pp. 5-7) distinguish three elements of a culture. The elements are: 1) the universals, the generally acceptable; 2) the specifics, the ideas acceptable to specific groups of the society; and 3) the alternatives, the elements of the culture in which the individual can, and frequently must, exercise choice.

We have noted in Section 2.0 the cultural universal of freedom attained through the cultivation of individuality within acceptance of responsibility.

We have then gone on in Sections 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 to delineate the ideas specific to the technology and the profession of guidance-in-institutions. Now we shall emphasize the alternatives, the ideas about which this Conference must express choice. We then proceed in Sections 7.0 and 8.0 first to indicate what is needed in revision if the alternative of profession in guidance is to be favored over that of technology and then to note what advantage might well accrue from favoring of the alternative of profession through employment in guidance-in-institutions.

We have offered in this Study the alternatives of technological or professional practice in guidance-in-institutions. We present you with an obviously difficult choice. At a time in which more counselors are needed because of 1) advancing enrollments in schools and colleges, and 2) expansion of the call for counselors in the elementary school, employment service, and mental and penal institutions, we also call for an expansion of the responsibilities and capabilities of the counselor beyond a previous challenge by the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1962, and Loughary, Stripling, and Fitzgerald, 1965). We do so because the Great Society calls for the liberation of all citizens. It remains for us to provide the means, while recognizing and modifying current attitudes.

There is probably a considerable gap between the quality of personnel in guidance at the present time and what is available to meet even our present expectation of programs in guidance. The gap is even more considerable and evident in relation to the expectations for guidance-in-institutions as we have spoken of them here. However, clarification of a basic professional goal for diverse programs of guidance-in-institutions can markedly reduce the quality gap. So can the clarification of organizational frames within which guidance can operate. Research resulting in verification and clarification of theory will also help in the improvement of quality. In the last analysis, however, quality of service will depend on the persons who offer the service. Quality of this sort can only be obtained 1) by trying to engender it further in those who practice and 2) by insuring that those who later enter satisfy the standard for entry and for improvement through the analysis of experience with some supervision. And so we must now confront the relationship among employers, government and university in the recruitment, education, and employment of counselors.

7.0 THE RELATIONS AMONG EMPLOYERS, GOVERNMENT, AND UNIVERSITY REQUIRED FOR IMPROVEMENT

Keppel (1961) has noted that, except for the few counselors in private practice, the counselor is in a paradoxical position in the United States. As an employee of an institution (school, college, business, government agency, or hospital) he supposedly serves the interests of this institution by making his, and its, clients fit better. Obviously, the counselor's is a delicate relationship. No institution can tolerate interests so variant from its own "sacred" interests that the existence of the institution as an organization is challenged seriously. And yet, if the counselor fails to confront his clients with their responsibility for fully voluntary participation, he fails in his professional responsibility. Furthermore, he inhibits the client's development of personal independence through present group membership, and probably also in a reasonable fraction of future group memberships. All this, mind you, when the particular institution may not be the best one to serve some of its clients' needs (such as college-prep curricula for those who truly want technical training).

It should be obvious that the manner in which the position of counselor is established and maintained will determine whether personal development through institution is at all possible or not - if student freedom is to be preserved as well. Except in businesses and private schools and colleges, positions of counselors are established and maintained under the auspices of local, state, and federal governments (Tiedeman, 1965). Thus, there really is no middle ground for the government to occupy in influencing the practice of counselors. Governments both establish the positions and the conditions of employment. However, the influence of government in the recruitment, education, and employment of counselors is, in potential, even more invidious. The majority of counselors are even educated in universities supported by state governments. The result is that the profession of counseling is established and maintained by government even to the extent of determining how much support is available for the education of counselors. The lines in the profession of counseling are therefore now largely etched 1) by the understanding of counseling as held in state departments of education and by state legislators, and 2) by the relation of federal to state government which permits federal intervention largely on an ad hoc and generally seriously circumscribed basis. It seems almost impossible that a profession can emerge under conditions so favorable to technologies!

Despite the fact that counselor education is now primarily located in state-supported universities the university potentially stands in a strategic place to modify the relationship - because of its traditional responsibilities for the recruitment, education, and placement of students. At the present moment there is considerable dissonance in the relationship of government and university which is detrimental to the development of programs of guidance-in-institution. As we have noted, the dissonance stems from the fact that governments support the training and employment of counselors only to meet a specific need, e.g., the counseling of talented high school students, counselors for vocational-technical schools, counselors and/or aides in employment services, counselors for the Veteran's Administration, for elementary school, mental health clinics, colleges, and community agencies. (Just think of the governmental agencies which are involved in one uncoordinated way or the other!) The procedure tends 1) to fractionate instruction in universities, 2) to favor instruction which emphasizes technique rather than the more fundamental understanding of "why," 3) to foster guidance as a technology, and 4) and most importantly, to make so remote the counselors' participation in interesting goal-determining problems (to say nothing of the students whom they serve) that "liberation through education" has virtually been removed from the experience of students. There is little wonder in our mind why we have become directed by efficiency - or safety - to such a degree that we have occasionally lost sight of goal determination on grounds other than efficiency. We have removed goal determination so far from most people that the power to choose goals really has little or no opportunity to develop.

Obviously government must remain in relation to universities and educational institutions as the source of funds. In this capacity government can cultivate the goals it favors. However, it must not remove the goal-determining problem from universities and educational institutions so greatly as it has now done through many of its programs. The program of guidance-in-institutions in a university is a program particularly hard pressed on this score for the following reasons:

1. Most programs lack unity, because so many disciplines and/or professions and/or technologies claim control.
2. Most programs lack faculty with a diversification of skill and background but with a common interest in a program of guidance-in-institutions.
3. Most programs teach a technology; they do not offer a variety of practical experience under supervision, where the expectation is that practice will be guided by all relevant knowledge,* (or the opportunity to test out which knowledge is relevant and which is not).
4. Most programs in counselor education foster research on counseling and/or testing; they do not foster research in career development, in identity formation, and/or in the sociology and economy of one or another seeming deterrent to the cultivation of individuality within current social structure (Tiedeman, 1965).

Programs of guidance-in-institutions are primarily in their present state, offering technological training rather than professional education, because a unified professional goal has for the most part been lacking. However, as the goal comes into focus in more instances, considerable financial support will be needed. The needed support will be for:

---

*The student's interest in service of a particular kind should be permitted to form in elections among opportunities for practice under expectations of high accomplishment (Conant, 1963).

1) fellowships for students;
2) salaries of new faculty members (clinical as well as academic), hired on a relatively permanent basis;
3) materials and equipment;
4) buildings; and
5) research and development.

As new types of graduates emerge from centers for education in guidance it will be necessary to expand the concept and structure of guidance-in-education to that of guidance-in-institutions - i.e., to include schools, colleges, employment services, hospitals, and businesses. Liberation through education is the joint job of social officer (such as teacher) and counselor acting in collaboration. This study must be told and retold.

But perhaps development occurs best through simultaneous attack on 1) goal formation, 2) education for pursuit of the goal, and 3) employment that will consummate personal goals. We leave it to you architects of the Great Society in this Conference to determine the sequence and the proportional attention to the several aspects as we move toward the goal. We trust that you do move toward the goal. A Great Society can do no less!

8.0 THE CAPABILITY OF GUIDANCE-IN-INSTITUTIONS UNDER SOCIAL PLANNING

We have presented the case for a professional practice collaborative with teaching as well as other social "engineering" which emphasizes the desirability of individual goal determination while refraining from goal selection for clients even when clients are not yet efficient at goal selection. We have also emphasized that Mark Hopkins on the log is not enough if the rate of such liberation through education is to be more than a spontaneous one. Mark Hopkins and a counselor are both needed on the log with that student. Should the Conference elect to emphasize this point it will do the best service for counselors that can be done. (The practice of counseling spends so much time trying to prove that it should exist that it devotes insufficient time to thinking about how it can exist better.) A statement by the Conference that teaching and counseling are both necessary to the collaborative cultivation of liberation through education might well provide the acceptance so necessary for a practice to move from justification to improvement.

The improvement of guidance-in-institutions will require modifications and expansion of educational structure along the lines we have sketched in Section 5.0. These modifications, combined with acceptance of the collaborative relationship between social officer and counselor, could greatly clarify the necessary practice of psychology in educational frames, a practice not now clearly understood (e.g., Allinsmith and Goethals, 1962; Bower, in press; Cutts, 1955; Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, 1961; Roe, Gustad, Moore, Ross, and Skodak, 1959; Thompson and Super, 1964). The psychologist could then be clear as to whether his work concerns acquisition of behavior as determined solely by the goals of the teacher, or the student's capacity to set his own goals. Furthermore, we could be clear that teaching, guidance, indeed any aspect of education, is an applied science (profession) and therefore significantly different from basic sciences - one at a time or in any combination. The applied art of counseling, in other words, is different from, not just "more than the sum of" psychology, sociology, and divers other basic disciplines. As Tiedeman has noted (1961) it is folly to believe that the psychologist as scholar has yet developed an adequate base for the educational practice we face now.

Supervised practice (Conant, 1963) is indispensable in training for guidance-in-institutions. Only by this means can the student gain a sense of the importance of various demands which are essential elements when choosing concepts which should guide professional activity in a specific instance.

Reorganization of responsibility, by dividing it among student, teacher, and counselor (leaving full responsibility for goal determination in the hands of student) provides the condition in which students can truly become independent. They can then turn only to self as the agent of destiny. This can be a harsh reality and therefore needs to be experienced with help of a skilled professional. However, it should not be avoided. This is why we have noted that every school seeking liberation through education - at a rate of occurence other than random - should have at least one fully trained guidance person on its staff. This person should have supervisory responsibility for all counselors on his staff. Supervision of subsidiary counselors should be practiced frequently and regularly until each counselor is judged qualified to practice without supervision. Such judgments will probably not be made until the subsidiary counselor has three to five years of supervised experience behind him after completing the presently recommended two-year graduate program in counseling education (Loughary, Stripling, and Fitzgerald, 1965).

Finally, reorganization of responsibilities can have a profound effect only if problems of recruitment, professional preparation, and employment are attended to simultaneously by university and government - in its dual role of employer and fund provider. The improvement in quality, while quantity is also expanded tenfold or more, requires administrative judgment of great wisdom. The Conference is invited to exercise that wisdom.

REFERENCES

Allinsmith, Wesley, and Goethals, George W. *The Role of Schools in Mental Health*. (Monograph No. 7, Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health.) New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. *Counselor Education: A Progress Report on Standards*. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1962.

Bower, Eli (Conference Chairman). *New Directions in School Psychology*. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health, Community Services Branch. (Report in preparation.)

Bruner, Jerome S. *On Knowing*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.

Conant, James B. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

Cutts, Norma E. (Ed.). *School Psychologists at Mid-Century*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, Inc., 1955.

Field, Frank L. *Toward a More Operational Goal for Guidance-in-Education*. The author, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1964 (a). (Ditto.)

Field, Frank L. *Needed: Better Teaching Materials for Guidance*. Santa Barbara, California: the author, University of California, 1964 (b). (Mimeo.)

Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. *Action for Mental Health*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1961.

Keppel, Francis. "Guidance: The Individual and the State." In College Entrance Examination Board. *Counseling in School and College*. (Number 8, College Admissions Series.) New York: The Board, 1961.

Loughary, John W., Stripling, Robert O., and Fitzgerald, Paul W. (Eds.). *Counseling, A Growing Profession*. Washington, D. C.: The American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Miller, George A., Galanter, Eugene, and Pribram, Karl H. *Plans and the Structure of Behavior*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1960.

Roe, Anne. *The Psychology of Occupations*. New York: John Wiley, 1956.

Roe, Anne, Gustad, John W., Moore, Bruce V., Ross, Sherman, and Skodak, Marie (Eds.). *Graduate Education in Psychology*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, Inc., 1959.

Smith, B. Othanel, Stanley, William O., and Shores, J. Harlan. *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* (Revised Edition). Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1957.

Sprinthall, Norman A., and Tiedeman, David V. "Guidance and the Changing American School." (A Probable chapter of Yearbook on Guidance, National Society for the Study of Education.) Cambridge, Mass.: the authors, 8 Prescott St., 1964. (Typewritten.)

Thompson, Albert S., and Super, Donald E. (Eds.). The Professional Preparation of Counseling Psychologists. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Tiedeman, David V. The Status of Professional Theory. Cambridge, Mass.: the author, 8 Prescott St., 1961. (Mimeo.)

Tiedeman, David V. "Purposing through Education: The Further Delineation of Goal and Program for Guidance." In Landy, Edward and Perry, Paul P. (Eds.). Guidance in American Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964 (a). Pp. 162-172.

Tiedeman, David V. "Some Productive Theoretical Developments: Career Development." Cambridge, Mass.: the author, 8 Prescott St., 1964 (b). (Mimeo.)

Tiedeman, David V. "Vocational-Technical Education and Occupational Guidance." Cambridge, Mass.: the author, 8 Prescott St., 1964 (c). (Multilith.)

Tiedeman, David V. "Education and the Profession of Education." Cambridge, Mass.: 8 Prescott St., 1964 (d). (Multilith.)

Tiedeman, David V. "The Relation of Government and University in the Professional Preparation of Counselors." Cambridge, Mass.: the author, 8 Prescott St., 1965. (Mimeo.)

Tiedeman, David V., and Field, Frank L. "Guidance: The Science of Purposeful Action Applied Through Education," Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 483-501.

Tiedeman, David V., and Field, Frank L. "Measurement for Guidance," Cambridge, Mass.: the senior author, 8 Prescott St., 1964. (Typewritten.)

Tomkins, Silvan S., and Messick, Samuel (Eds.). Computer Simulation of Personality: Frontier of Psychological Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.

SOCIAL CHANGE AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

Bob G. Woods, Professor
University of Missouri

In our dynamic society educational leaders are constantly faced with the problem of narrowing the gap between the dominant social changes of the time and the lagging curriculum of the schools. Assuming that the purpose of our educational system is to prepare students to become contributing members of society, there is an inverse relationship between the quality of a school's program and the magnitude of the gap that exists between its curriculum and society. In truly outstanding colleges and universities, provisions are made for continuous curriculum development, and the gap between society and their educational programs is much narrower than it is with institutions of average stature.

The purpose of this paper is to present an overview of the relationship between social change and the task of curriculum development in an attempt to shed light on the present dilemma in the field of counselor education. The problems and processes presented herein are presented from the point of view of a person trained in the field of curriculum who professes little knowledge of the field of counselor education.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

American colleges and universities constitute the chief source if not the only source of professionally trained scientists, scholars, teachers, counselors, and other highly skilled people who play a prominant role in shaping our society as well as in serving societal needs. In order to provide an educational program for preparing professionally trained people to meet the demands of society, it is imperative that college faculties be sensitive to the needs of society.

According to Herrick and Tyler (1950), there are three basic determiners or orientations for curriculum planning--our cumulative and organized bodies of knowledge, the individuals seeking an education, and the society served by the educational institution. Historically, each of these has played a varying role as curriculum determinants in elementary, secondary, and higher education.

The focus of the curricula of our earliest colleges was derived from known bodies of knowledge and little or no attempt was made to provide an education commensurate with either the needs of society or the student. A study comparing the statements of college aims in 1921 with such statements of an earlier period of American education revealed that during the nineteenth century the focus of the college curriculum was on the comprehension of subject matter for its disciplinary value in sharpening mental powers. Following World War I, college aims devoted less attention to the disciplinary function and began to show a growing concern for both the student as an individual and for civic and social responsibility. (Koos and Crawford, 1921).

A later study of a similar nature, in which the stated or implied purposes of 55 colleges in 1954 were compared to the 1931 objectives of these same institutions, revealed a trend toward focusing aims on the needs of the individuals being educated. The catalog statements of goals placed increased stress on "self-discovery," "self-improvement," "self-analysis," "mental health," and "personal and social adjustment." (Umstattd, 1956).

Although the focus of educational aims varies among colleges and among college departments, there is evidence to show that during the past decade an increasing concern has prevailed for needs of society in college curriculum planning. According to Eckert:

> A survey of recent statements and discussions of college aims suggests several trends, the first and most sharply defined being a wider recognition of the social responsibilities of higher institutions: Depressions, wars, and the problems of an atomic, "sputnik," and guided-missile age are apparently provoking a serious reappraisal of the social mission of higher education [underscoring not in the original]. Whether the goals are proposed for individual colleges or for American higher education as a whole, they seem to be invested with a greater sense of public obligation. Thus they emphasize, more than formerly, the college's responsibility for clarifying the meaning of democracy and for educating people to live richly and productively in a free society. (Eckert, 1958).

It is apparent, therefore, that curricular emphasis in higher education has shifted since the turn of the century from the disciplinary values of bodies knowledge toward greater attention to both individual and societal needs. It ould be understood, however, that all three referrants interact to shape the rriculum of any particular institution and that the relative importance of ch varies from time to time and from one institution to another. "The cur-iculum serves, in a sense, as a kind of social barometer, reflecting though ften with a great lag, significant pressures in international, national, and ocial affairs." (Eckert, 1958). This conference on government-university elations for which this paper is being written gives support to the thesis that ocietal needs are currently playing the dominant role in shaping college and niversity curricula.

OCIAL FORCES

The educational system of any society is primarily designed to perpetuate nd to improve the culture of the society it serves. Ultimately, the persistent alues, beliefs, mores, and aspirations of the people of a given society will be ncorporated into the curricula of educational institutions. However, schools do not react hastily to societal pressures, which, in general, is beneficial to the society they serve. On the other hand, curriculum revision can be much too slow for the welfare of society. An understanding of the ways in which societal changes affect the curriculum of an educational institution is of value in understanding the present dilemma in counselor education.

In the paper written for this conference by Professors Tiedeman and Field (1965), the present status of counselor education was related to the three elements of culture that have been presented by Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1957). A further delineation of this theoretical framework for studying the relationship between society and curriculum is attempted herewith.

The element of culture which is comprised of the generally accepted ideas, customs, and social mores that are relatively stable is referred to as the universals. In the curriculum of an educational institution, the universals are reflected in the general education program that is required of all students.

Professors Tiedeman and Field present the "democratic concept of freedom" as an example of a basic universal of our culture which must undergird curriculum at all levels. Few people would disagree.

Elements of the culture that are accepted by a certain stratum or portion of society and not by society at large are described by Smith, Stanley, and Shores as specialties. Two functions of the various types of technical guidance illustrate this element--first, "all are remedial in nature," and, second, "all have as their goal a better fit of individual students into some existing organization or process." (Tiedeman and Field, 1965). These beliefs that are common to members of the profession are well established in the curriculum for the training of counselors. However, since there are citizens within our society who would not accept these functions as being appropriate for counselors, they are correctly classified as specialties.

The third element of culture that has been labeled by Smith, Stanley, and Shores as alternatives is the one that causes the greatest controversy in curriculum development and, also, is a partial explanation for the holding of this conference. Alternatives comprise the leading edge of culture. Ideas, theories, technology, and practices that depart from those that are commonly accepted by a professional group or some other stratum of society, create issues. Advocates of the new ideas or ways of doing things strive to bring about their general adoption, while the more skeptical members of the group resist the change. In a dynamic society the rapidity of cultural change introduces many alternatives and requires frequent decision-making, whereas a static society is rarely confronted with such choices.

The theory of alternatives provides a plausible explanation of the confrontation that occurs when an individual or a group of individuals bring pressure to bear on changing the curriculum of an educational institution. Some colleges and universities yield to pressure more readily than others and are willing to introduce innovations on an experimental basis. Others resist change until it becomes obvious that their curriculum is suffering from obsolescence as compared to the curricula of institutions of comparable stature.

An alternative which presently confronts the field of counselor education, according to Tiedeman and Field (1965), is the establishing of counseling as a profession as opposed to continuing counseling on a technological level. It appears that an element of the leaders in the field of guidance and counselor education are of the belief that there is a need for counselors with higher level competencies together with commensurate responsibilities--a level of professionalization that even goes beyond that which is presently endorsed by the professional organizations. This would involve much greater autonomy and freedom of action than presently exists in most of the counseling positions prescribed by the various federal agencies. It seems unlikely, therefore, that a complete synchronization of efforts in counselor education on the part of universities and government will occur as long as the counselor positions established and supported by government agencies are at the technical level.

The confrontation resulting from this alternative, as well as the greatly expanded need for counselors, is a partial explanation of why colleges and universities have not geared their counselor-education curricula to meet the present demands of government for trained counselors. Shall the emphasis in counselor education be on quantity or quality, or shall it be on both? Tiedeman and Field take the position that there is "no choice but to pursue both quantity and quality at the same time." Closer agreement is needed between government agencies and universities to overcome this problem.

Although the tax-supported government agencies currently exert the greatest force on the curricula of institutions of higher learning, there are many other social forces that both directly and indirectly affect the educational programs of colleges and universities. Large private foundations through grants for research and development make their influence felt. Through "buying" the time of the more productive and influential members of college faculties for research and writing projects, attention is often diverted from curricular development. In other instances financial support is granted for curricular experimentation or for implementing new types of programs.

Accrediting associations represent another type of social force that exert pressure on the various curricula of colleges and universities. The regulations of associations stipulate minimum standards which usually have a positive influence on a curriculum. In some instances, however, the regulations are realtively inflexible and, therefore, serve as a restraint to experimentation, innovation, and improvement. Educational leaders sometimes develop the attitude that, if their program meets accreditation standards, they should not jeopardize their status by making modifications.

It is difficult to assess the influence exerted on the curricula of colleges and universities by the various types of special interest groups. The college curriculum is usually less susceptible to the pressures of these groups than are the elementary and secondary school curricula. Nevertheless, civic groups, religious organizations, and various types of economic organizations representing financial institutions, business, industry, or labor create pressures to which college and university curriculum-makers must be sensitive.

The curriculum of any institution reflects the many forces that are brought to bear on it. Rarely does one of the forces over-power the others to the extent that it dictates the nature of the curriculum. Instead, in a democratic society the forces of all the groups tend to balance one another, and thus enable curriculum builders to provide for the best interests of the society at large.

OBSTACLES TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The population explosion, the explosion of knowledge, technological advancements, changing social conditions at home and abroad, and a host of other developments are placing new demands on virtually every facet of the educational program of our large universities. The demands are so great and the resources (both human and material) so limited that every university is forced to determine priorities--priorities with respect to which of its programs it will expand and/ or upgrade. In determining these priorities such factors as cost, personnel, facilities, area needs, social trends, and tradition must be taken into account.

Regardless of whether the focus is on expanding the offerings to provide for greater numbers of students or on upgrading the quality of the program, many obstacles arise in the curriculum development process. This is true even when funds have been made available for making the intended revision. In addition to obtaining the needed facilities, instructional materials, and personnel, changing a curriculum usually requires changing people--a task involving major problems.

In most institutions of higher learning the curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty. Major changes, however, such as adding or deleting a new program or adopting a new curricular organization, require administrative approval by the president and the governing board. Although the faculty is responsible for the curriculum, it is indeed rare to find a faculty that functions efficiently in curriculum revision and improvement. The many demands on the time of both administrators and the teaching faculty is perhaps the greatest obstacle to curriculum improvement.

Professors and other members of the teaching faculty can and do initiate changes in the courses they teach, but their influence in inducing change will rarely extend beyong the confines of their own classroom. The findings of Brickell's study of curriculum change in secondary schools in the State of New York supports this thesis:

> Instructional changes which call for significant new ways of using professional talent, drawing upon instructional resources, allocating physical facilities, scheduling instructional time or altering physical space--rearrangements of the structural elements of the institution--depend almost exclusively upon administrative initiative. To understand this, it must be remembered that the teacher is not an independent professional, not a private enterpreneur free to alter his working situation when he chooses--not free to decide what he will teach to whom at what time and at what price. He is instead a member of the staff of a stable institution. (Brickell, 1961).

It is often difficult to obtain the sincere cooperation of college professors in serving on curriculum committees or in participating in broad programs of curriculum development. Many professors have their "pet" courses and are inclined to feel threatened by any suggestion of curriculum modification. In some cases, the lack of cooperation is due to the resentment of having to take time from special research projects. University faculty members realize that professional recognition and advancement, rightly or wrongly, are based on research and writing--not on teaching or service projects. According to research evidence, curriculum committees, when they do exist, normally do not devote their time to broad curriculum planning. (Eckert, 1958). In short, curriculum development in universities is frequently neglected.

Another major problem confronting higher education which tends to hamper curriculum change is the dearth of qualified personnel. College instructors are not being trained in sufficient quantities to meet the rapidly growing demands. This void causes universities to vie with each other in attempting to obtain the services of outstanding professors. Even when funds are made available through grants from government agencies, it is often not possible to obtain well-qualified counselor educators. In some instances, instructors of marginal qualifications are available, but only on the basis of employment with tenure. Universities are reluctant to expand their programs under such conditions. There is a need for much more experimentation with team teaching and the use of newer media as ways of extending the effectiveness of capable college professors. It is possible that such experimentation could bring about a partial solution to the shortage of instructors.

Institutions of higher learning are also reluctant to divert members of their professorial staff from the primary functions of advisement of students and teaching regularly scheduled courses to working in short-term institutes. The highly regarded universities have attained prestige and stature through the success of their graduates. Both college administrators and professors are prone to guard the quality of their well-established programs. There is greater concern for status than growth.

The curricula for professional education programs, such as teacher education and counselor education, are comprised of courses from several disciplines that are normally under the jurisdiction of different academic departments. Although this arrangement provides the framework for quality programs, it creates problems in attempting to bring about both curricular change and articulation between the disciplines. Each department has its own goals, its own projects, and its own methods. Often one department has little interest in or knowledge of what others are doing. Each is convinced that what it is doing is of prime importance. An academic department in a university has a great deal of autonomy which is zealously guarded by its staff members. From the standpoint of academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge, autonomy of the disciplines is a valuable asset. But from the point of view of staff members who are charged with the responsibility of developing and expanding programs of counselor education, autonomy of the disciplines presents problems. Elam presents the following discourse on this matter:

> I emphasize this pluralism in the academic world not to deplore it but to call attention to the problem that it presents for those who are concerned with the organization of the curriculum as a whole. For the curriculum-builder is concerned not only with the structures of the individual disciplines, but also with the structure of the instructional program within which the fields of knowledge find their place. The problem can be very simply stated, if not easily solved: what general structure of the curriculum can be developed so that autonomy of the parts does not result in anarchy in the program as a whole? (Elam, 1964).

The above-mentioned obstacles comprise only a portion of those encountered in curriculum development. They should, however, enable lay people to achieve a better understanding of the operation of a university faculty and a better appreciation of the over-all task of curriculum development.

PROCESSES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Since curriculum theory is still in its infancy, processes for curriculum development are not highly developed. The lack of progress in this important field of endeavor may be attributed to the many variables that must be considered in curriculum work. Among the more important variables that affect curriculum development are the rapidly expanding bodies of knowledge, a dynamic society and its changing culture, unique human beings, and learning processes about which little is known. (Eckert, 1958). In spite of the many problems that confront curriculum workers, conceptual frameworks that offer promise for the improvement of curricula are beginning to emerge. The major tasks that comprise a curriculum development program are briefly described at this point to further delineate the problems confronting educational institutions in developing new or improved programs.

While not entirely discrete, for purposes of discussion the tasks involved in curriculum development are classified as follows:

1. Assessment of the institutional situation;
2. Formulation of objectives;
3. Selection and organization of subject content;
4. Selection of teaching methodology; and
5. Evaluation.

Basic to any program of curriculum development is the task of assessing the institutional situation. Before curriculum decisions can be made wisely, information must be obtained concerning the adequacy of the existing curriculum in fulfilling the broad general goals of the institution. Indeed the goals of the institution also need to be examined to determine if they are appropriate for the society the institution serves. The needed information can be obtained through follow-up studies of former students, surveys of employers and employment needs, testing programs, the use of lay advisory groups, and other ways.

The task of formulating objectives normally follows the assessment of the institutional situation. Objectives serve as guidelines for the selection and organization of subject content, the designing of instructional activities, and the evaluation of learning. The statements of policies and standards developed by the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, and the American School Counselor Association present broad general objectives of counselor education and describe competencies needed by counselors. In a curriculum development program for counselor education these statements make excellent starting points for the formulation of teaching objectives.

Functional teaching objectives are stated in terms of behavioral outcomes that encompass cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning. In professional education programs such as counselor education, it is especially important to incorporate cognitive objectives that go beyond the levels of knowing and comprehending. Counselors, for example, must possess the ability to make application of knowledge, to be able to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate data for the purpose of decision-making in the course of their work. Objectives pertaining to the development of appropriate attitudes and values must also receive attention in a curriculum development program for counselor education.

Selecting and organizing subject content normally follows the formulation of objectives. It is in this stage of curriculum development that decisions must be made concerning the scope of the subject matter to include in the curriculum. Because of the rapid expansion of knowledge in all fields some basis for content selection must be adopted. Among the various procedures that are used are the following: research and experimentation; analysis of life's activities; and, consensus of experts. Much attention is currently being devoted to teaching the structure of knowledge in the various disciplines as opposed to teaching a large body of factual information. By learning the basic generalizations and principles that constitute the conceptual framework of a discipline, the individual is able to analyze and synthesize new knowledge when he encounters it. The newer curriculum studies are also emphasizing the teaching of methods of inquiry used by scholars of the discipline. The learning of structure and methods of inquiry contribute to retention and transfer and thus enhance the effectiveness of an instructional program.

Along with the selection and organization of content, curriculum workers must _select the teaching methodology_ to employ for presenting the subject content. Efficiency in the attainment of the objectives is of prime importance in deciding whether to cover the subject content through a teacher-centered approach, group discussion, independent study, or some type of practicum. A working knowledge of learning theories is required for designing instructional activities of optimum value. The availability of instructional materials and equipment also must be considered in making decisions in this phase of curriculum development.

Evaluation is also an important aspect of curriculum improvement. Various types of data are collected and analyzed to appraise the over-all effectiveness of the curricular improvement program. Particular attention is devoted to assessing the degree of attainment of the objectives. If the objectives are being attained satisfactorily and efficiently, the program has been successful. Contrary to the opinion of many educators, evaluation is not deferred to the end of the curriculum development program but begins with the formulation of objectives and permeates the entire process.

STRATEGY FOR CHANGE

The problem of curriculum reform in the field of counselor education is very similar to the problems which are being faced by virtually all academic and professional education fields. The fields of mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages were the first to receive critical examination in our current era of curriculum reform. Curriculum study groups headed by academicians and supported by grants from the Federal Government, private foundations, and universities have conducted nation-wide curriculum development programs directed primarily toward elementary and secondary education. New curricular materials have been developed, field tested, and disseminated throughout the nation. Although some of the curriculum studies were begun as much as ten years ago and their materials have been available commercially for more than five years, their impact has not been of a revolutionary nature. Curriculum change is slow at best! "Schools as structured institutions remain stable." (Brickell, 1961).

The current curricular reform has now spread to the collegiate level and includes the behavioral and social sciences, humanities, and practically all of the vocational and professional fields. Educational institutions are being bombarded from every side to change their curricula.

The controversy that arises in determining what should comprise the content of the curricula of educational institutions is not of recent origin however. It is interesting to note that approximately 23 centuries ago Aristotle wrote:

> For mankind are by no means agreed about the things to be taught, whether we look to virtue or the best life. Neither is it clear whether education is more concerned with intellectual or with moral virtue. The existing practice is perplexing; no one knows on what principle we should proceed--should the useful in life, or should virtue, or should the higher knowledge, be the aim of our training; all three opinions have been entertained. (Jowett, 1905).

During the middle of the nineteenth century the English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, very pointedly raised this same curricular issue in his essay entitled, "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?" (Smith, Stanley, and Shores, 1957). In this famous document, Spencer made a case for a curricular change from emphasis on bodies of knowledge in the various disciplines to a more practical type of education attuned to individual and societal needs.

In our current curriculum reform we are faced with the same type of questions. What should our educational institutions teach? What should be the focus of the curriculum? What areas of the over-all educational program should be given priority? More particularly, in the field of counselor education the questions are: What are the competencies needed by counselors to meet the needs of our space-age society? What should be the content and organization of the curriculum in order to develop the needed competencies? What priority should programs for counselor education receive in the total offerings of leading universities? The first two questions have been partially answered by the broad policies and principles set forth by the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the standards for counselor education issued by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (Loughary, 1965). More specific answers to these questions are needed, however, for the implementation of curriculum development programs. The answer to the last question requires a decision by each university engaged in counselor education.

A school, whether it be an elementary school or a university, is a social institution; and, as such, it is not subject to frequent and rapid changes. In order to initiate a program of curriculum change, some type of energizing force must operate. That force may be internal or external to the institution. If it is internal the force may generate from either the administrative or the instructional level. If the force is external, it may stem from some relatively small element of society or from the public at large. The field of counselor education is currently the recipient of massive pressures for changes of both a qualitative and quantitative nature.

Whether the force that initiates a curricular change is located within or without an educational institution, the leadership for the change must come from within the organization. Changes that are forced upon a faculty by an outside change-agent are doomed to failure. In a study of the dynamics of instructional change, Brickell (1961) found that innovations of major scope are introduced by administrators. In a university, the academic dean of the school or college is directly responsible for providing leadership for curriculum development in his division. As mentioned earlier, the time and energy of deans, to say nothing of budgeted funds, are often expended on administrative committments long before they get to the task of undertaking a curriculum improvement program. It is not surprising that curriculum revision in institutions of higher learning proceeds slowly.

In addition to having internal leadership at the administrative level, members of the teaching faculty who are responsible for implementing the changes must be involved from the beginning of the curriculum development program if it is to be successful. A common procedure in curriculum development is to have a steering committee comprised of representatives from a cross-section of the departments that will be affected by any change that may occur. The coordinating of the program by a steering committee provides an excellent opportunity for the exercise of multiple-leadership. Curriculum development requires many types of expertness and the genuine cooperation of many people--instructors who are experts in the disciplines and who are charged with the responsibility of working with students, administrators who make decisions in establishing priorities, specialists in curriculum engineering, experts in research and evaluation, and agencies that supply the funds and/or hire the products. It is unlikely that one or two individuals charged with the responsibility of supervising a given educational program will be endowed with all of the skills needed to make significant curriculum changes. When the fulfillment of all of these roles fall on the shoulders of a very few interested people, curriculum development will be slow and probably ineffective. It is necessary, therefore, to give vent to multiple-leadership in order to narrow the curricular gap.

If there is any magic in expediting the important task of curriculum development, it is the magic that comes through cooperation--the type of cooperation that comes with the willingness and the ability of each party to the process to empathize with the professional obligations and vested interests of others. This invitational conference should contribute to the development of the needed cooperation in the field of counselor education. Although diverse points of view and disagreements are sure to exist in regard to the content and implementation of counselor education curricula, these differences will ultimately contribute to an improved curriculum--assuming a cooperative and empathetic spirit prevails. A cooperative approach usually does not result in revolutionary changes but does produce programs that are likely to endure the test of time.

REFERENCES

Brickell, Henry M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany: State Education Department, 1961.

Broudy, Harry S., B. Othanel Smith, and Joe R. Burnett. Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964.

Eckert, Ruth E. "Colleges and Universities--Programs," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960, pp. 268-85.

Elam, Stanley (ed.). Education and the Structure of Knowledge. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964.

Herrick, Virgil and Ralph W. Tyler (eds.). Toward Improved Curriculum Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Jowett, Benjamin (Translator). Aristotle's Politics. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Koos, Leonard V. and C. C. Crawford, "College Aims: Past and Present," School and Society. 14:499-509, December 1921.

Loughary, John W. (ed.). Counseling, A Growing Profession. Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

McGrath, Earl J. Memo to a College Faculty Member. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

Smith, B. Othanel, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. Revised edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962.

Tiedeman, David V. and Frank L. Field. "From a Technology of Guidance to the Profession of Guidance-in-Society: A Challenge to Democratic Government," Study Number 5, Invitational Conference on Government-University Relations in the Professional Preparation and Employment of Counselors, Washington, D. C., June 1965.

Umstattd, James G. "Trends in Avowed Aims," Journal of Higher Education. 28: 147-54, March 1957.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS

IN THE

INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS IN THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSELORS

Distribution of Conference Participants

Representing the Government		
Federal Level	**43**	
State Level	**10**	
Local Level	**6**	
Total	**59**	**59**
Representing Private Agencies		
National Level	**11**	
State Level	**2**	
Local Level	**5**	
Total	**18**	**18**
Representing Universities		
Total	**37**	**37**
	TOTAL	**114**

ADELSON, Marvin
Principal Scientists
Systems Development Corporation

ALKIRE, Edward M.
Chief, Counseling and Training Section
Veterans Administration Regional Office (California)

ALLER, Curtis C.
Professor of Economics
San Francisco State College

AMOS, William E.
Chief, Division of Youth Employment and Guidance Services
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training

ANDERSON, Joseph P.
Executive Director
National Association of Social Work

ASH, Lane C.
Associate Director, Professional Resources
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education

AUBURN, Norman P.
Special Assistant for University Relations
Agency for International Development
U.S. Department of State

BANISTER, Olive K.
Executive Director
Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services (Cleveland)

BARBER, Joseph E.
Educational Specialist (Guidance)
American Vocational Association

BATTLE, Mark
Acting Deputy Director
Neighborhood Youth Corps
U.S. Department of Labor

BEDELL, Ralph
Director, Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch
U.S. Office of Education

BEESLEY, Kenneth H.
Acting Provost, Teachers College
Columbia University

BOWER, Eli M.
Consultant, Mental Health in Education
National Institute of Health

BRADEN, Samuel E.
Vice-President and Dean for Undergraduate Development
Indiana University

BRAYFIELD, Arthur
Executive Officer
American Psychological Association

BRECKENRIDGE, A. C.
Vice-Chancellor and Dean of Faculties
University of Nebraska

BROWN, Nathan
Assistant Superintendent
Pupil Personnel Services
New York City Board of Education

CALLIS, Robert
Dean, Extra-Divisional Administration
University of Missouri

CHEADLE, Vernon I.
Chancellor
University of California, Santa Barbara

CHENAULT, Joann
Acting Program Chairman
Counselor Education
University of Pittsburg

CLARK, Kenneth B.
Professor of Psychology
City College, New York

CLIFFORD, Paul I.
Professor of Educational Psychology
Atlanta University

COTE, Theodore J.
Program Specialist of Vocational Guidance
Auxilliary Service Branch, Division of Vocational Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

COTTINGHAM, Harold F.
Professor of Education
Florida State University

COTTLE, William C.
Professor of Education
Boston College

DARLEY, John G.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota

DILLENBECK, Douglas
Director of Guidance Services
College Entrance Examination Board

DONOVAN, Reverend Charles F.
Academic Vice-President and Dean
School of Education
Boston College

DUGAN, Willis E.
Professor of Educational Psychology
Director, Counselor Education and Student Personnel Work
University of Minnesota

EMBREE, Royal B.
Professor of Educational Psychology
Director, NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute
University of Texas

FEINGOLD, S. Norman
National Director
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service

FITZGERALD, Paul W.
Supervisor of Guidance
Pinellas County Schools (Florida)

FLETCHER, Frank M.
Professor, Department of Psychology
Ohio State University

GARRETT, James F.
Assistant Commissioner, Research and Training
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

GILKEY, Margaret J.
Director of Guidance Services
Dade County Public Schools (Florida)

GINSBERG, Mitchell I.
Associate Dean
School of Social Work
Columbia University

GJERNES, Oscar
Supervisor of Technical Services
North Dakota State Employment Service

GLEASON, John
Branch of Youth Employment
Division of Youth Employment and Guidance Services
U. S. Employment Service

GORDON, Jesse
Associate Professor of Psychology and Social Work
University of Michigan

GOTTLIEB, David
Head, Program Evaluation Branch
U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, Job Corps

GREGORY, Francis
Assistant Director for Manpower Development
Office of Manpower, Automation and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

HALPERIN, Samuel
Director, Office of Legislation
U. S. Office of Education

HANSEN, Donald A.
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of California, Santa Barbara

HARMON, John E.
Director, Manpower Development
Chamber of Commerce of the United States

HARRINGTON, Fred Harvey
President
University of Wisconsin

HAY, Louis
Assistant Director-Clinical
Junior Guidance Classes
Board of Education (New York City)

HILLYER, Cecile
Chief, Division of Training
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

HILTON, Everett P.
Director, Vocational Education
Kentucky Department of Education

HILTON, Mary N.
Deputy Director, Women's Bureau
U. S. Department of Labor

HITCHCOCK, Arthur A.
Executive Director
American Personnel and Guidance Association

HOUGHTON, Hubert W.
Chief, Counselor Preparation Unit
U. S. Office of Education

HOYT, Kenneth B.
Professor of Education
University of Iowa

HULSLANDER, Stewart C.
Associate Professor of Education
University of Michigan

HUNTER, Armand L.
Director, Continuing Education Service
Michigan State University

JETT, Robert W.
Chief, Division of Program Policies and Standards
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

JOHNSON, Walter F.
Professor, College of Education
Michigan State University

KAUFFMAN, Joseph F.
Consultant, Commission on Academic Affairs
American Council on Education

KEEHAN, Virginia
Coordinator, Women's Training Centers
Project Development, Job Corps
U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity

KELLER, Robert J.
Dean, College of Education
University of Minnesota

KLEIN, Earl
Acting Deputy Assistant Director for Manpower Evaluation and Field Services
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

KRANZ, Harry
Assistant Administrator for Manpower Operations
Bureau of Employment Security
U. S. Department of Labor

KUNZE, Karl R.
Manager, Personnel General Department
Lockheed-California Company (California)

LESHNER, Saul S.
Executive Director
Jewish Employment and Vocational Service (Pennsylvania)

LEVINE, Louis
Director
United States Employment Service

LEVINE, Morton
Acting Chief, Division of Youth Occupational Training Research
Office of Manpower, Automation and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

LEWIS, Frank L.
Budget Examiner
Bureau of the Budget

LONG, Adelbert C.
Chief, Work Experience and Training Program Staff
Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

McCARTHY, Joseph L.
Dean, Graduate School
University of Washington

McCLARY, George O.
Supervisor of Guidance Services
Richmond Public Schools (Virginia)

McCREARY, William H.
Chief of Guidance Services
California State Department of Education

McGOUGH, Norman E.
Chief, Branch of Counseling and Testing Services
U. S. Employment Service

McGOWAN, John F.
Project Director and Professor of Education
University of Missouri

MALCOLM, David D.
Professor of Education and Coordinator, Guidance Studies
San Diego State College

MILLER, Paul A.
Superintendent of Schools (Nebraska)

MORELLI, Emery
Chief, Counseling Special Applicant Services
Utah State Department of Employment Service

MOWRER, George
Director of Guidance Services
St. Louis Board of Education

MUNGER, Paul
Professor of Education
University of Indiana

MURPHY, Hugh C.
Administrator, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

NYGARD, Arthur N.
Manpower Specialist
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

ODGERS, John
Director, Division of Guidance and Testing
Ohio State Department of Education

PATTERSON, C. H.
Professor of Education
University of Illinois

PAULSON, Blanch
Director, Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services
Board of Education (Chicago)

PECK, Cecil P.
Chief, Psychology Division
U. S. Veterans Administration

PORTER, Thomas L.
Coordinator, Rehabilitation Counselor Training
University of Georgia

PRAGAN, Otto
Assistant Director of Education
AFL-CIO

PRICKETT, John S. Jr.
Assistant Director
Georgia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

PRITCHARD, David H.
Chief, Counseling and Manpower Utilization Branch
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training
U. S. Department of Labor

PUTH, Alvin D.
Assistant Director
National Rehabilitation Association

RIOUX, J. William
Acting Director, Programs for Education of the Disadvantaged
U. S. Office of Education

ROEBER, Edward C.
Professor of Education
University of Michigan

SAMLER, Joseph
Chairman, Vocational Rehabilitation Board
Department of Veterans Benefits
U. S. Veterans Administration

SCHWADA, John W.
Chancellor
University of Missouri

SCOTT, C. Winfield
Chairman, Department of Educational Psychology
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University

SCURLOCK, Voyle
Director, Oklahoma Rehabilitation Division

SHERBURNE, James
Vice-Chancellor
Oregon State System of Higher Education

SMALLENBURG, Harry
Director, Division of Research and Guidance
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools Office

SOLEM, Arnie
Regional Administrator
Bureau of Employment Security (Kansas City Office)
U. S. Department of Labor

SPRINGOB, H. Karl
Acting Director, Vocational Service Center
YMCA of Greater New York

STARCHER, George
President
University of North Dakota

STOUGHTON, Robert W.
Chief, Bureau of Pupil Personnel and Special
Education Services
Connecticut Department of Education

STRINER, Herbert E.
Director of Program Development
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

STRIPLING, Robert O.
Professor of Education and Head
Department of Personnel Services
University of Florida

SUPER, Donald E.
Professor of Psychology and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

THOMPSON, Albert S.
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

THOMPSON, Warren
Director
California Department of Rehabilitation

TIEDEMAN, David V.
Professor of Education
Associate Director, Center for Research in Careers
Harvard University Graduate School of Education

VETTER, Betty M.
Executive Director
Scientific Manpower Commission

WALKER, John L.
Chief, Division of Manpower Services
U. S. Department of Employment Service

WASHINGTON, Bennetta
Director, Women's Job Corps
U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity

WEIDER, Arthur
Director
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service (New York)

WELLMAN, Frank E.
Specialist, Guidance and Counseling Programs
Division of State Grants
U. S. Office of Education

WHITLOCK, Charles P.
Assistant to the President for Civic and Governmental Relations
Harvard University

WIENER, Frederick
Executive Director
Vocational Guidance Service (Texas)

WRENN, C. Gilbert
Chairman, Panel on Counseling and Selection
Professor of Educational Psychology
Arizona State University

ZEFF, Ben M.
Deputy Director for Educational Programs
U. S. Department of Defense

SPECIAL GUESTS

BEHLOW, Robert R.
Executive Secretary
National Manpower Advisory Committee
U. S. Department of Labor

DENENMARK, Frieda
Research Specialist, Bureau of Research
Division of Adult and Vocational Research
U. S. Office of Education

DUGGER, Roy
Deputy Director
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
U. S. Office of Education

FANTACI, Anthony
Chief, Division of Youth Employment and Guidance Services
Bureau of Employment Security
U. S. Department of Labor

GOLDSTEIN, Harold
Assistant Commissioner for Manpower and Employment Statistics
Bureau of Labor Statistics
U. S. Department of Labor

HILL, Beatrice
Chief, Branch of Technical Development
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Washington, D. C.

LEVIN, Shirley
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service

McDANIELS, Carl
Associate Professor of Education
George Washington University

MORSE, The Honorable Wayne
United States Senator, Oregon

ROBSON, Thayne
Executive Director of the President's Committee on Manpower
U. S. Department of Labor

RUTTENBURG, Stanley
Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor

STEWART, Maxine
Acting Chief, Branch of Occupational Outlook and Specialized Personnel
Bureau of Labor Statistics
U. S. Department of Labor

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1965

8:30 - 9:00 Registration
Delaware Room

9:00 - 10:15 Opening Session
Delaware Room

JOHN F. McGOWAN .... Presiding
Project Director and Professor of Education,
University of Missouri

C. GILBERT WRENN .... Welcome
Professor of Educational Psychology, Arizona
State University and Chairman, Panel on
Counseling and Selection

FRED H. HARRINGTON .... Speaker
President, University of Wisconsin

10:15 - 10:30 Coffee

10:30 - 11:45 Second General Session
Delaware Room

REACTION TO DR. DARLEY'S PAPER

DAVID H. PRITCHARD .... Presiding
Chief, Counseling and Manpower Utilization
Branch, Office of Manpower, Automation and
Training

JOHN G. DARLEY .... Author
Professor and Chairman, Department of
Psychology, University of Minnesota

JAMES F. GARRETT .... Discussant
Assistant Commissioner, Research and Training,
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

ARTHUR L. HARRIS .... Discussant
Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational
Assistance Programs, U. S. Office of Education

LOUIS LEVINE .... Discussant
Director, United States Employment Service,
Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor

CECIL P. PECK .... Discussant
Chief, Psychology Division, Veterans Administration

12:15 - 1:45 **Luncheon**

Continental Room

JOHN W. SCHWADA .... Presiding
Chancellor, University of Missouri

THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE .... Speaker
United States Senator, Oregon

2:00 - 6:00 **Small Group Sessions**

See attached list for groups and room assignments

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1965

8:30 - 10:45 **Small Group Sessions**

11:00 - 12:30 **Summary Session - Reports from Rapporteurs**

Delaware Room

JOHN F. McGOWAN .... Presiding
Project Director

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—234-306

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE TASK GROUP

JOHN F. McGOWAN
Project Director
University of Missouri

WILLIS E. DUGAN
University of Minnesota

DAVID H. PRITCHARD
Office of Manpower,
Automation, and Training

FRANK L. SIEVERS
U.S. Office of Education

DAVID V. TIEDEMAN
Harvard University

C. GILBERT WRENN
Arizona State University
(ex officio)

THE TASK GROUP

REPRESENTING UNIVERSITIES

G. LESTER ANDERSON
State University of New York

MITCHELL I. GINSBERG
Columbia University

GEORGE E. MOWRER
St. Louis Schools

PAUL F. MUNGER
University of Indiana

C. H. PATTERSON
University of Illinois

REPRESENTING GOVERNMENT

WILLIAM E. AMOS
Youth Employment and Guidance

MARGUERITE COLEMAN
New York: Bureau of Employment Security

THEODORE COTE
Vocational Education

JAMES GARRETT
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

DAVID GOTTLIEB
Office of Economic Opportunity, Job Corps

JOHN WALKER
U.S. Employment Service

REPRESENTING BASIC DISCIPLINES

JOHN G. DARLEY
(Psychology)
University of Minnesota

HERBERT E. STRINER
(Economics)
Upjohn Institute

DONALD A. HANSEN
(Sociology)
University of California
Santa Barbara